

M. SILIN

A Critique of Masarykism



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian
by ANATOLY BRATOV

М. А. Силин

КРИТИКА ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИХ
КОНЦЕПЦИЙ МАСАРИКИЗМА

На английском языке

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

HX
518
-R4
55513

First printing 1975

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1975

© Translation into English. Progress Publishers 1975

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

C $\frac{10506-976}{014(01)-75}$ 70-75

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	7
<i>Chapter 1.</i> The Historical and Social Conditions for the Development of the Workers' Movement and Ideological Struggle in the Late 19th and Early 20th Century in Czechoslovakia	27
<i>Chapter 2.</i> Critique of the Philosophical Foundations of Masarykism	58
<i>Chapter 3.</i> Critique of the Sociological, Economic and Socio-Political Concepts of Masarykism	98
<i>Chapter 4.</i> Masarykism, the Official Ideology of Bourgeois Czechoslovakia	142
<i>Chapter 5.</i> The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in the Struggle for the Victory of Marxism-Leninism, the People's Democratic System and Socialism in Czechoslovakia	155
<i>Chapter 6.</i> The Revival and Failure of Masarykism	239
<i>Conclusion</i>	300

PREFACE

The 24th Congress of the CPSU made a profound and creative analysis of today's ideological problems; it revealed the increasing role of Marxist-Leninist science in the world today and stressed the importance of the struggle against bourgeois ideology and imperialist ideological subversion.

The Report of the Central Committee to the 24th Congress noted: "We are living under conditions of unabating ideological struggle, which imperialist propaganda is waging against our country, against the world of socialism, using the most subtle methods and powerful technical means."¹

The 24th Congress substantiated the necessity for giving timely, resolute and effective rebuff to bourgeois ideology and to all revisionist counterfeits of Marxism-Leninism. It pointed out the specific problems around which the most intense ideological struggle is raging. One such problem is that of democracy, about which the Report of the CC CPSU to the 24th Party Congress had the following to say: "... Questions of democracy are now the crux of the ideological and political struggle between the world of socialism and the world of capitalism. Bourgeois ideologists and revisionists raise a hypocritical hue and cry, alleging that we have no democracy. They offer us all sorts of 'advice' on how to 'improve' and 'democratise' socialism.

¹ *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1971, p. 109.

But their concern is not for socialism, of course. They would like to return us to bourgeois practices and, therefore, try to force bourgeois democracy on us, a democracy for exploiters, alien to the interests of the people."¹

The characteristic feature of the crisis in Czechoslovakia in 1968-1969 was that anti-socialist forces and imperialist propaganda, hoping to undermine socialism, conducted ideological and political subversive activities under the banner of "democracy" and "improvement" of socialism, under the banner of reviving the ideology of Masarykism.

For this reason it becomes an important task in the struggle against bourgeois ideology to subject the ideological aspect of the events in Czechoslovakia to scientific analysis.

Contemporary bourgeois ideology is in serious crisis. It is incapable of offering ideas that can inspire the working people to historic achievements. That is why, during the events of 1968-1969, for example, imperialist reaction and the anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia which it goaded tried to galvanise the old ideological weapon of the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie, namely, the philosophy of Masarykism. The anti-socialist forces advanced the slogans of "Back to Masaryk", or "We will always proceed from the ideas of Masaryk", all of which was accompanied by propaganda about a "new model of democratic socialism" and "new variants of Marxism".

Masarykism never was, as its adherents claimed, a socialist ideology. Developed in the late 19th century by Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, a professor at Prague University, it was, rather, the ideology of the Czech bourgeoisie, and it became the official state philosophy when Masaryk was elected President of the first Czechoslovak Republic in 1918. Much later, in the 1960s, Masaryk's name cropped up once again on the political scene in Czechoslovakia.

For many years in the interim, however, the bourgeois press in the West continued to pay homage to him, keeping

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 99.

alive the haloed image of Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, scientist, philosopher, humanist, democrat, politician, diplomat and religious man—a man whom everyone could call his or her brother. The Czechoslovak Republic was hailed as a model state with all the bourgeois freedoms, and Masaryk himself was referred to as “the Great Czech”.

In bourgeois Czechoslovakia, the idealisation of “Masarykist democracy” as a model for all to copy reached the proportions of a cult of the individual, the individual being Masaryk, who personally told the workers that his republic was a model “socialist country”.

During the events of 1968-1969 in Czechoslovakia, it came out that some Czechoslovak intellectuals who sincerely considered themselves to be Marxists were acquainted with Marx only through a Masarykist interpretation, having previously been exposed only to Masaryk's lecture course on “the foundations of Marxism”. Some people spoke of Masaryk as the ideologist of socialism, of “humane socialism” or of “socialism with a human face”. Revisionists camouflaged their campaign against Marxism with verbal recognition of Marxist teaching, but in action, in reviving Masaryk's ideas, they were trying to substitute Masarykism for Marxism.

The newspaper *Mladá fronta*, for instance, wrote in March 1968 that Tomáš Masaryk and his works were “a compass for the future of our developed socialist society”.¹

Who was Masaryk and what were his real views on Marxism and socialism?

Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk was born on March 7, 1850 in Hodonín, Moravia. In 1872-1873, he studied philosophy and philology at the University of Vienna. In 1876, he defended his doctoral thesis in philosophy. In 1882, he became a professor of philosophy at the Czech University in

¹ *Marxism-Leninism—the Single International Teaching*, 3rd edition, Moscow, 1968, p. 219 (in Russian).

Prague, where he worked until 1914. It was there that Masaryk organised and delivered his lectures on the "foundations of Marxism". In 1898, using these lectures as a basis, he published a book called *The Philosophical and Sociological Foundations of Marxism. Studies on the Social Question by Masaryk, Professor of the Czech University in Prague*.¹ The book was actually setting forth Masaryk's anti-Marxist ideas.

Masaryk's book and two works by Eduard Bernstein—an article entitled "Problems of Socialism" and a book *The Prerequisites of Socialism and the Tasks of Social-Democracy*—revealed the fundamental coincidence of Masaryk's and Bernstein's views, for they both were attempting to supplant the revolutionary theory of Marxism with reformist and revisionist concepts. It was no accident that the two men published articles in which they praised each other.

In 1899, V. I. Lenin subjected Bernstein's revisionism to severe criticism, but gave Masaryk's work no special attention. We may conclude, however, that he was familiar with Masaryk's book because in his article "Karl Marx", published in 1915, he classified it as revisionist criticism of Marxism, the essence of which was substitution of "bourgeois views" for Marxism.

Masaryk's book did, however, receive extensive criticism from Plekhanov, who felt obliged to respond to Masaryk's appraisal of his, Plekhanov's, orthodox position in Marxism. In 1901, Plekhanov published an article entitled "About Masaryk's Book", in which he sharply criticised Masaryk's anti-Marxist concepts and showed that these concepts, purportedly serving the "need to move forward", actually meant "going back".²

¹ The title of the book was T. G. Masaryk, *Otázka sociální, základy marxismu filosofické a sociální*, Praha, 1898. Further references to *Otázka sociální* (*The Social Question*), 1946 edition, Vols. I and II.

² G. V. Plekhanov, *Selected Philosophical Works*, Vol. II, Moscow, 1956, p. 669 (in Russian).

The subsequent history of the development of Masarykism confirms the correctness of Plekhanov's assessment, for revisionism ultimately led Masaryk to out-and-out anti-communism.

Specifically, it should be noted that Masaryk persistently propagated a negative attitude towards Soviet Russia. For example, in 1920, in his *Soviet Russia and Us*, he wrote: "...We have no choice but to reject Bolshevism as unacceptable in our conditions.... We have shown that Lenin's system is no good for Russia either; of course, it is up to Russia herself and the Russians to draw conclusions from this."¹

Was this not why the world bourgeoisie lavished such excessive praise on Masaryk, why it created a cult of Masaryk even during his lifetime, and why statues were erected in his honour at all crossroads and squares?

The revival of Masarykism by the anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia during the 1968-1969 events showed that those forces really needed Masarykism not as a banner of "democracy" and "humanism", but as a banner of nationalism and anti-communism.

The political direction taken by the events showed how dangerous the slogan "Back to Masaryk" was not only for socialist Czechoslovakia but for the international communist movement as a whole. The anti-socialist plot in Czechoslovakia was as much a real threat to world peace as was, in its day, the Munich agreement, which had set the stage for the Second World War. The 1968 plot could have led to a new world war because it, too, involved an attempt to strike at the positions of socialism in Europe, with a subsequent onslaught against the entire socialist world by the more aggressive forces of imperialism.

It was no accident that in the summer of 1968, the Military-Political Academy, which had become during the events a political and ideological centre for the Right-wing forces, issued an official memorandum calling for a re-

¹Masaryk, *Sovětské Rusko a my*, Praha, 1920, p. 88.

examination of the country's relationship to the Warsaw Treaty.

However, the attempt to destroy socialism, to introduce the Trojan horse of counter-revolution into socialist Czechoslovakia under the flag of Masarykism and the theory of "humane socialism" was frustrated, a fact attributable to "the staunchness of the Marxist-Leninist core of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and determined action by Czechs and Slovaks devoted to the cause of socialism and by allied countries loyal to the principles of socialist internationalism. . .".¹

In its document, *Lessons of the Crisis Development in the Communist Party and the Society After the 13th Congress of the CPCz*, a Plenary Meeting of the CC CPCz in December 1970 gave an exhaustive Marxist analysis of the causes of the events.

The document reads, in part, as follows:

"As a result of relaxation in political and ideological work, the struggle against bourgeois ideology, against petty-bourgeois tendencies and ideological subversion lost its vigour. This unavoidably led to weaker ties between the Party and the working people.

"The consequences of our errors and shortcomings were all the more serious because large petty-bourgeois segments of our society, both in the countryside and in the cities, still carried considerable weight. These strata represented a distinct political trend, with old traditions, strong organisation and a clear-cut petty-bourgeois *ideology* of nationalism, *Masarykism* and social-democratism, which had taken root and penetrated into the consciousness of a certain part of the working class. . . . All this created fertile soil for the penetration and activation of opportunist tendencies [emphasis added—M. S.]."²

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1972, p. 290.

² *Poučení z krizového vývoje ve straně a společnosti po XIII. sjezdu KSČ*, Praha, 1971, p. 7 (hereafter referred to as *Poučení z krizového vývoje*).

The present book examines Masarykism as a revisionist, anti-Marxist trend which emerged during the growth of the working-class movement in Czechoslovakia and which reflected the crisis of the traditional forms of bourgeois ideology as well as the trends in its adaptation to the era of triumphant Marxism and socialist revolutions. This adaptation was aimed at undermining Marxism and socialism from within and replacing Marxism with bourgeois theories by falsifying it and speculating on the problems, difficulties and contradictions of the working-class movement and socialism.

A definition of Masarykism should take into account not only what Masaryk himself preached but also the ways in which Masarykism was used and interpreted, that is, it must be drawn not simply from the letter of Masarykism but from its ultimate social orientation and its actual historical role. This role was fully disclosed by life itself: the events of 1968-1969 fully exposed its unscientific, anti-socialist and reactionary essence.

At the same time those events also showed that to define Masarykism simply as a bourgeois ideology of the imperialist period and Masaryk as a bourgeois ideologist is not enough.

Masaryk's social objective as a bourgeois ideologist and politician was not merely to repulse Marxism, the working-class movement and socialism, but, by criticising and falsifying Marxism and by pretending to be fighting for the "true" interests of the working class and socialism, to gain control of the working-class movement, to tear it away from scientific socialism and divert it from the road of revolution on to the road of bourgeois reformism.

Lenin saw this general transformation of bourgeois ideology as an attempt by decayed bourgeois liberalism to reanimate itself in the form of socialist opportunism; the successes of Marxism made its enemies pretend to be Marxists and enter the field of Marxist research and socialist studies with a revision of the basic propositions of scientific

socialism, a revision intended to provide theoretical grounds for substituting bourgeois reformism and socialist opportunism for Marxism.

From this broad historical perspective Masarykism is unquestionably a revisionist ideology.

Lenin viewed revisionism, in the broad sense of the word, as a method used by bourgeois ideology in its struggle against Marxism, as a trend of bourgeois ideology which admits a verbal or organisational link with Marxism, but whose aim it is to undermine Marxism from within by criticising, revising and distorting it.

The revisionist character of Masarykism was thoroughly exposed by the Czechoslovak anti-socialist forces themselves which had made Masaryk their ideological authority.

It was precisely the revisionist essence of Masaryk's concepts that made it possible for contemporary revisionists to adapt themselves to the new historical conditions as they sought to prove that Marxism should either be supplemented or fully replaced by Masarykism. It was no accident that the situation developed to a point where the Right-wing opportunists demanded that the CPCz adopt Masarykism as its official ideology with the ultimate aim of restoring "Masaryk's socialism".

Indeed, Masaryk called himself a socialist, but he never was one.

Why was the ideology of Masaryk, the ideology of that "political captain of Czechoslovak financial capital",¹ to use Klement Gottwald's expression, revived during the critical events? Precisely because Masarykism was a revisionist ideology! And not an ordinary, rank-and-file revisionism, but a generalised revisionism which had integrated all the revisionist schools and trends of any note, a revisionism which was not only in complete agreement with Bernsteinism but vied with it for first place. It is no accident that bourgeois ideologists attempt to pass Masaryk off as one of the founders of "Western unorthodox Marxism".

¹ Kl. Gottwald, *Spisy*, Vol. VIII, Praha, 1961, p. 88.

Not the least among the factors playing a role in the attempt to substitute Masarykism for Marxism and to replace real socialism with Masaryk's socialism with its cult of abstract humanism and abstract democracy was Masaryk's skill in manipulating socialist terminology, his deftness in combining international revisionism with "Czech philosophy" and "Czech socialism".¹

Being a synthesis of the bourgeois ideology and revisionism of its time, Masarykism was naturally used by the Right-wing opportunists in Czechoslovakia as a basic "encyclopedia" of revisionism and anti-communism, a "handbook" for the distortion of the theory and practice of socialism.

Lenin wrote that the revisionist trend in Social-Democracy did not have to develop and take shape; it sprang up fully formed, like Minerva from the head of Jove, for as regards its substance it was transferred directly from the bourgeois to socialist literature.²

In a sense, Masarykism as a bourgeois ideology was brought into the socialist literature by Masaryk himself. Without putting anyone to any trouble he "brought" himself, a bourgeois ideologist and reformist, into the socialist literature; parasitising on the problems of the working-class movement and scientific socialism, he preferred to battle not on his own but on his enemy's ground, the field of Marxist research, in order to revise Marxism, implant bourgeois socialism in the working-class movement, and free the socialist movement of Marxism.

The fact that formally Masaryk was neither a Social-Democrat nor Communist did not dismiss him as a revisionist but rather made his revisionism "supra-party", that is, even more subtle and dangerous.

When he was President Masaryk raised his revisionism to the government level, making Masarykism the state doc-

¹ *Dějiny KSČ*, Praha, 1961, p. 126.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 353-54.

trine. This, too, lent Masarykism a "supra-party" aura.¹

The fact is, however, that although Masaryk had no formal party affiliation he was not only the ideological inspirer of Right-wing Social-Democracy in Czechoslovakia which adopted a revisionist stand, but had a decisive organisational influence on it—the Rightist leadership of the Social-Democratic Party did nothing without his instructions!

Typical of Masarykism was its unity of revisionism and anti-communism, a feature that anticipated the relationship between contemporary anti-communism and revisionism. Today, anti-communists openly speak of modern revisionism as their "best ally", having vital importance for the "free world", and call it a clear manifestation of anti-communism in the "Red Empire". Specifically, the anti-communists believed that international revisionism's "Prague experiment", if it succeeded, could change communism and indeed change Europe and show the "helpless" world a new way.

From the theoretical standpoint Masarykism is not a definite, cohesive and well-worked-out system. Lenin's appraisal of the philosophical foundations of revisionism which, he said, consisted in substituting eclecticism and sophistry for dialectics² and idealism for materialism, is fully applicable to Masarykism.

In structure, Masarykism is a highly inconsistent and eclectic trend in philosophy, a mechanical and unsystematic agglomeration of various idealistic schools and movements, an endless chain of manifold borrowings from the philosophical arsenal of bourgeois, social-reformist and revisionist ideologists.

Masaryk's principal objective was to fight Marxism by any means, including out-and-out falsification of Marxism; this predominant negative orientation of Masarykism is

¹ According to the Constitution of the Czechoslovak Republic, the President could not hold membership in any party.—*Ed.*

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 234.

what accounted for the fact that its own theoretical position was weak, incomplete, fragmentary and eclectic.

The philosophical concepts of revisionism are extremely mobile and inconstant; like a chameleon, revisionism changes its concepts to blend with the "colour" of the times.

So it was with Masarykism. Proceeding from the needs of the struggle against Marxism at one or another point in history, it manipulated the appropriate set of idealist philosophical concepts, without bothering, however, to connect them logically—not even within the bounds of idealism. It is no accident, therefore, that Masarykism is self-contradictory at every step.

Elements of objective and subjective idealism, theism and mysticism, Kantianism and Machism, pragmatism and positivism, anthropologism and materialism are combined by Masaryk in a most eclectic and unprincipled manner.

All this made scientific criticism of Masarykism difficult, while at the same time simplifying the task of the modern revisionists: revisionists of any stripe could draw from Masaryk whatever concepts and arguments they felt were most suitable.

Indeed, Masarykism implicitly incorporated all the basic slogans used by revisionism at its various stages of development, such as "Back to Kant", "Back to Hume", "Back to Comte", "Back to Mach", and even "Back to Marx", a slogan especially typical of contemporary revisionism.

An historical fact that must be considered, however, one reflecting the specificity of the ideological situation in Czechoslovakia, was the tremendous influence of Masarykism on the subsequent development of intellectual life in that country, which hampered the spread and understanding of Marxism. On the one hand, Masarykism was made the "Czech national philosophy", while on the other, Masaryk was considered by many to be the first propagandist of Marxism in Czechoslovakia.

In connection with the definition of Masarykism as revisionism, of great importance are the description and clas-

sification of literature on Marx which Lenin gave in the concluding section of his article "Karl Marx". His analysis helps us understand the essence of revisionism and why Masarykism falls into this category.

Lenin divided all those writing on Marx into "...three main groups: Marxists who, in important matters, adhere to Marx's point of view; bourgeois writers, in essence hostile to Marxism; and revisionists, who, while claiming to accept certain fundamentals of Marxism, in fact replace it with bourgeois conceptions. The Narodnik attitude towards Marx should be considered a peculiarly Russian variety of revisionism".¹

The Narodniks, it may be recalled, had nothing in common, from an organisational standpoint, with Marxism or Social-Democracy and, in fact, waged an uncompromising struggle against them; nevertheless, Lenin called the Narodnik criticism of Marxism revisionism.

This is a very important point in Lenin's approach to revisionism as a whole, as well as in his appraisal of Masaryk, because the group into which he placed Masaryk comes right after the Narodniks.

Lenin's classification of literature on Marx contains the following basic groups:

1. First of all he gives a bibliography of Marxist literature on Marx.

2. Then, from "works by opponents of Marxism" he points out writings by Tugan-Baranovsky, S. Prokopovich, W. Sombart, M. Adler, and others.²

3. Next, he gives a general description of literature "on the question of the two main currents in the interpretation and development of Marxism—the 'revisionist' and the... 'orthodox'", and mentions Bernstein, Kautsky, Lafargue, Pannekoek, and others.³

4. The next group concretises the general description

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 85.

² Ibid., p. 88.

³ Ibid., p. 90.

given above: "The Russian Narodniks on Marxism: N. K. Mikhailovsky..."¹ etc.

5. And, finally, immediately after listing this group, Lenin writes: "Besides the Narodniks, the following may also be mentioned: N. Kareyev ... Masaryk ... Croce", obviously considering this group to be very close to the Narodniks.

As we can see, Masaryk did not end up among "bourgeois writers", but clearly in the company of revisionists.

Kareyev stood on liberal Narodnik positions in his historical works, one of which (on the history of the French peasantry) Marx gave a positive appraisal to, and in his philosophical views he was very close to N. K. Mikhailovsky's school of subjective sociology.

As for Croce, in his younger years he was a student of Antonio Labriola, took a keen interest in Marxism and considered himself a Marxist; later, however, he withdrew to revisionist positions.

Was the composition of this group accidental? No, it was not. What Kareyev, Masaryk and Croce had in common was revisionism. And theirs was very close in content to Mikhailovsky's revisionist trend, in direct proximity to which Lenin placed the group in question.

It should be noted that Lenin had taken full account of the critique of revisionism given by Plekhanov. In putting these three revisionists in the same group, for example, Lenin unquestionably bore in mind that in several works criticising international and Russian revisionism Plekhanov had shown that the essence of the views expounded by Bernstein, Mikhailovsky, Kareyev, Masaryk and Croce was identical and that on many issues their views fully coincided.

Helpful to our understanding of Lenin's classification are Plekhanov's works "About Masaryk's Book" and "About Croce's Book", in which he criticised the two men's views.

¹ Ibid., p. 91.

In "About Croce's Book", he pointed out, for instance, that Croce considered himself a Marxist whereas he actually sought to "modify" Marxism in favour of Kantianism.¹

As for Kareyev, Plekhanov criticised his views along with those of other revisionists in many of his works.

In "About Croce's Book", Plekhanov pointed out the connection between Croce's and Kareyev's views. In his article "Cant Against Kant or Mr. Bernstein's Spiritual Testament", he spoke of the closeness of "Mr. Bernstein and Mr. Kareyev",² and on another occasion Plekhanov underlined the identity of Kareyev's and Mikhailovsky's views and characterised the two men as leaders of the "army" of opponents of historical materialism.

The purpose of Lenin's classification of literature on Marx was to reveal the relationships among revisionists of every stripe and the unity of the whole Bernstein-Mikhailovsky-Kareyev-Masaryk trend, something that Plekhanov had already come close to doing in his article "About Masaryk's Book":

"When we read the section that Mr. Masaryk devoted to historical materialism we frequently recall our kind, old Mr. Kareyev. Mr. Masaryk, who knows Russian and often cites Russian writers, is obliged to Mr. Kareyev for quite a bit. He borrowed many of his wonderful 'formulations'.... He likewise took a thing or two from the 'formulations' of Mr. Nikolai Mikhailovsky and other Russian 'critics' of historical materialism.... With all these borrowings and his verbosity and pedantism, Mr. Masaryk has turned out, in his 'criticism' of the historical views of Marx, to look very much like Mr. Eduard Bernstein."³

In conclusion, Plekhanov left not a shadow of a doubt about the revisionist character of Masaryk's book *The Social Question*, recommending it to anyone interested in a "critique" of Marxism because it revealed "the psycholog-

¹ G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 702.

² Ibid., p. 391.

³ Ibid., pp. 680-81.

ical basis underlying this currently fashionable so-called criticism".¹

It follows that Plekhanov considered that book more than just merely revisionist, but a kind of classical model embodying many characteristic features of revisionism.

Plekhanov's assessments on this score were fully developed in Lenin's description of the literature on Marx.

Subsequently, not only did Masaryk do nothing to contradict his being classified as a revisionist, but, on the contrary, especially after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, he modernised his revisionist concepts and made full use of the revisionist device of fighting Leninism from the positions of defending "true Marxism".

Let us take a few of Masaryk's utterances from the early twenties. Here, for example, are some from a speech he made on September 24, 1920 to miners working in Březové Hory near Příbram. He began by saying: "I want to say to you, workers, and mainly to you, Socialists, a few plain, almost working man's words. I was a worker myself...."²

However, under the guise of "plain, working man's words", Masaryk revised and falsified Marx's views and sought to discredit Leninism, the socialist revolution and the building of socialism in the Soviet country: "I say here, with a clear conscience and to the best of my knowledge, that for us, Czechs, the Russian model is no good.... My only wish for you is that, as Marx wanted, you stick to really scientific socialism.... Your European socialism, according to Marx's teaching, is scientific socialism. And this is what distinguishes your socialism from the socialism in Russia."³

In an article entitled "Revolution and the Bolsheviks", Masaryk tried to present himself as a defender of Marxism

¹ Ibid., p. 680.

² Masaryk, *O bolševismu*, Praha, 1926, p. 11.

³ Ibid., p. 13.

as he hurled accusations at the Bolsheviks, saying that they "quite unworthily deviate from the truth in presenting the views of Marx and Engels and conceal their real essence".¹

But what, in Masaryk's view, was the "real essence" of Marxism? It was Marxism with its revolutionary substance expunged! Falsifying the views of Marx and Engels, Masaryk held that "the Bolsheviks, in seeking grounds for their own revolutionism, make completely erroneous references to Marx and Engels. Both of the latter rejected revolutionism in the socialist and scientific period of their development", "adopted the scientific and evolutionary point of view",² "and while the Bolsheviks dream of the revolutions of the old days, the uncultured, absolutist days when violence reigned, Marx and Engels, after long mental labour, arrived at the ideal of the revolution of the new times, a 'cultured' revolution ensuring a new administration"³; "Lenin, however, considers armed revolutions the main creative means",⁴ and, therefore, the Bolshevik "revolution was and is a political revolution, not a social and economic one".⁵

In an effort to discredit the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia, Masaryk gave as the main reason for this victory "Lenin's ultra-pacifism", his demand that the war be stopped no matter what, which supposedly assured for Lenin the support of the war-weary soldiery: "This is why Lenin won, and not because he made a correct Marxist analysis of the status of world capitalism and socialism."⁶

In *World Revolution*, Masaryk again opposed Lenin to Marx: "Lenin declares his communist programme to be true Marxism. But Lenin is wrong. Marx went through several stages in his socialist development. It is necessary

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 27.

² Ibid., p. 28.

³ Ibid., pp. 28-29.

⁴ Ibid., p. 28.

⁵ Ibid., p. 32.

⁶ Ibid.

to distinguish two Marxisms.... In his second stage Marx had already abandoned the revolutionism of his youth.... Lenin and his followers cite the Marxism which Marx and Engels had themselves repudiated.... Generally speaking, Lenin cites Marxism incorrectly."¹

As we can see, Masaryk was trying to show Lenin to be a "revisionist" and himself to be a defender of "true" Marxism and "true" socialism.

Even as President, Masaryk remained a revisionist and continued to play the role of defender of "true" Marxism, while in fact he distorted the views of Marx, Engels and Lenin in order to replace Marxism with his own bourgeois concepts. And it was precisely an underestimation of the revisionist essence of Masarykism that accounted for its tenacity; during the events of 1968-1969 Masaryk was revived not as a President, but as a theorist of the "new", "Czechoslovak socialism", that is, as a revisionist.

As L. Hrzal writes, "the ideas of Masaryk and of similar 'authoritative' socialists were in the past years regarded uncritically in Czechoslovakia and even appeared in the mass media".² The revisionists of 1968 "began, in line with old revisionist theories following T. G. Masaryk's model, to look for differences between Marx's and Lenin's theories".³ Essentially, Masaryk was an ideologist of "democratic socialism", of whose revisionist character its contemporary theorists speak quite openly. "The revisionist movement in Social-Democracy," writes Friedrich Brandt, "can be equated with the movement of democratic socialism."⁴

In the matter of defining Masarykism as revisionism, some people hesitate because Masaryk was the President of the Czechoslovak bourgeois republic.

¹ Masaryk, *Světová revoluce*, Praha, 1925, p. 211.

² L. Hrzal a kolektiv, *Antikomunismus a ideologický boj*, Praha, 1972, p. 148.

³ Ibid., p. 235.

⁴ *Die Neue Gesellschaft*, Nr. 11, 1972, S. 866.

However, Millerand was President of the French bourgeois republic (1920-1924), yet Lenin called Millerandism (ministerialism, ministerial "socialism") "practical Bernsteinism".¹ He saw in French Millerandism "the biggest experiment in applying revisionist political tactics on a wide, a really national scale".²

Through figures like Millerand and Masaryk revisionism was raised by the bourgeoisie of a number of capitalist countries to the level of state or government policy. Since the First World War, Millerandism has been essentially the basic tactic of the Right-wing socialist leaders.

It is still not fully appreciated, however, that Masaryk provided the main ideological inspiration not only for bourgeois reformism in Czechoslovakia but for Right-wing revisionism as well, that all the basic anti-communist and anti-Soviet "concepts" used by the proponents of Right-wing revisionism in Czechoslovakia have Masarykism as their historical source.

The fact that Masarykism had many faces, that it went through many socio-political and ideological metamorphoses was due to the conditions of the class struggle in Czechoslovakia. However, coming out politically now as bourgeois liberalism, now as bourgeois conservatism, now as "humane" socialism, Masarykism always remained revisionism in theory, parasitising on the socialist ideal of the modern era. That is what paved the way for Masaryk in 1968, when Masarykism in its revisionist essence was once again revived.

Vasil Bil'ak, Member of the Presidium of the CC CPCz and Secretary of the CC CPCz, in analysing how such an experienced party as the CPCz and such a cultured people as the Czechoslovak people could so quickly fall prey to false, non-class slogans,³ connected this fact to inadequate

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 352-55.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 15, p. 37.

³ Vasil Bil'ak, *Pravda zostala pravdou. Prejavý a články. Október 1967-december 1970*, Bratislava, 1971, p. 282.

exposure of the historical roots of revisionism in Czechoslovakia: "The tasks of our ideological work must consist in giving a fuller explanation of the very concept of revisionism and opportunism with which Vladimir Ilyich Lenin struggled all his life. We must show that this is not only a contemporary development but that it has its deep roots in the past." In criticising foreign revisionism we must not "forget the seats and creators of revisionism here at home, we must not forget what has grown up on our own soil in recent years".¹

¹ Ibid., p. 392.

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORKERS' MOVEMENT AND IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE IN THE LATE 19th AND EARLY 20th CENTURY IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

1. THE EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF AN ORGANISED WORKERS' MOVEMENT

At the early stage of its development the workers' movement was spontaneous and unorganised; it did not pursue its own, independent class goals and interests, but consisted merely of actions taken by the proletariat in support of the demands and interests of the bourgeoisie. In his article, "The Bourgeoisie and the Counter-Revolution", Karl Marx, characterising the actions of the proletariat in the English bourgeois revolution of 1648 and the French revolution of 1789, wrote: "In both revolutions the bourgeoisie was the class that *really* formed the van of the movement. The *proletariat* and the *strata of the burghers which did not belong to the bourgeoisie* either had as yet no interests separate from those of the bourgeoisie or they did not yet constitute independently developed classes or subdivisions of classes. Hence where they came out in opposition to the bourgeoisie, as for instance in France in 1793 till 1794, they fought only for the realisation of the interests of the bourgeoisie, even if not *in the fashion* of the bourgeoisie. The *whole French terrorism* was nothing but a *plebeian manner* of settling accounts with the *enemies of the bourgeoisie*, with absolutism, feudalism and philistinism."¹

For this reason, a real workers' movement, with its proletarian demands separate from the interests of the bour-

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1969, p. 139.

geoisie, took shape and developed considerably later, basically with the appearance of independent *class organisations* of the proletariat, i.e., trade unions and especially workers' parties. In the main, then, the history of the workers' movement, in the true sense of the word, began with the emergence of these working-class organisations; it began with the independent class demands and goals as manifested in the economic, political and ideological forms of the proletariat's class struggle against bourgeoisie. It is from this point on, from the time when this *organised* workers' movement first came into being, that this chapter examines the workers' movement in Czechoslovakia. Our discussion will be limited to a brief description of the two organisational forms of the workers' movement—the trade union and the party forms.

The trade unions arose in Czechoslovakia as an organisational form of the workers' movement, as an organisation of the Czechoslovak proletariat, primarily in the sphere of the proletariat's *economic* struggle against capital. Such struggle, however, does not yet impart full class consciousness to the proletariat. *Political and ideological* forms of the class struggle are also needed before the proletariat can rise to an understanding of its historic mission of transforming the world on a socialist basis. The crucial condition necessary for success in the proletariat's political struggle is the establishment of the highest form of working-class political organisation—a party which is governed in its activity by proletarian, socialist ideology.

The Emergence and Formation of the Trade Union Movement

The emergence and formation of the working class on Czech territory is directly linked with the rise and development of industry, primarily machine industry. The first machines appeared in the Czech lands in 1776, at the textile factories of Lejtenberger. The first steam-operated cloth-

processing machine was installed in 1804 in a textile factory in Liberec. Gradually, the industrial revolution spread throughout Bohemia. As industry expanded, the proletariat grew.

Exploitation of the workers at the factories prompted them to fight for their vital, at first only economic, interests. Economic workers' organisations began to take shape. In 1817, Bohemia's first workers' society—the Old Prague Fraternity—was organised. The work of the Fraternity attracted workers, and the society grew rapidly. In the event of death, disability and even unemployment, members of the society received a certain amount of material assistance.

The activity of the Fraternity showed workers that they needed collective associations to protect their interests.

In their fight against increased exploitation the workers initially destroyed machines, seeing in them the source of labour intensification. Gradually, however, the workers came to realise that they could not halt the development of machine industry or improve their own situation by wrecking and destroying the machines in the factories. They began to realise that their fight had to be directed not against the machines, but against the capitalists.

In 1841, there were 1,889 enterprises in Bohemia with machine equipment. By this time, the Czech proletariat was beginning to acquire class awareness, at first in the sphere of its economic interests. In the 1840s, the workers at some industrial enterprises organised mutual aid societies.

The workers' situation was very difficult. The working day was up to 14-15 hours long, child labour was widely used, and the living standard of the workers in Bohemia was extremely low. Mutual aid societies were a must for the workers. Czech historians of the workers' movement justifiably consider that the organisation of these societies was the beginning of factory worker organisation.

In 1844, workers at several factories staged the first, albeit unsuccessful, strike in Prague. The strike was broken after 525 strikers were arrested. But the workers' movement

gained maturity and experience in the course of the class struggle. The first actions of the workers frightened the Czech bourgeoisie, and after the 1848 revolutions in France and Germany it went into the service of the Hapsburg dynasty. This period in the development of the Czech workers' movement was characterised not only by their economic struggle. The Czech people were at that time under foreign domination and were faced with the problem of national liberation. The Czech proletariat took an active part in this struggle. Drawing on its experience in organised, basically economic, strike activity, the Czech working class participated in the political struggle of 1848: it took up arms and went into the streets of Prague against the Hapsburg oppressors. In its initial stage, the revolutionary struggle against these oppressors was waged by the Czech working class. This struggle was highly appraised by Marx and Engels.

After the Prague uprising of 1848, however, the liberal bourgeoisie succeeded in diverting the Czech people from revolutionary political struggle and in pursuing a policy supporting the Hapsburg monarchy and tsarist Russia. The reactionary nature of the Czechoslovak national movement during the 1848-1849 period that followed was pointed out by Marx. The Czech bourgeoisie was drawing the workers along the harmful, ruinous path of supporting the counter-revolutionary interests of the Hapsburg monarchy. This was the unhappy result of the slow development and weakness of the Czech workers' movement of that time.

The Czech bourgeoisie used every means possible, and often with success, to impede the emergence of workers' organisations. In this, the monarchy aided the bourgeoisie in every way. A law passed in 1852 prohibited the formation of workers' organisations. However, this did not stop the formation and development of an organised workers' movement.

In the 1860s, there was a noticeable increase in the number of workers' organisations in Czechoslovakia. Their

emergence was connected with the rapid growth of industry and a widespread strike movement, as a result of which the workers won legislation limiting the working day to ten hours for carpenters, eleven for roofers and twelve hours for shoemakers. That was the first success of the working-class movement. Working time had never before been regulated by any kind of law in Bohemia. The workers were fully aware of their first success. They now brought up with increasing frequency the question of freedom of assembly, which meant that the trade unions were now also making political demands. In late March 1870, a strike broke out in the Libig factory in Svárov. When the workers attempted to unite with workers from other factories, the police, who were called to suppress the strikers, used firearms, with consequent casualties, both killed and wounded.

The actions taken by the workers aroused apprehension in government circles, to the extent that on April 7, 1870 a law was passed permitting workers' organisations and recognising the workers' right to strike. This lent added impetus to the growth of trade unions; in two years' time there were 11, and in three years—36, with a total of 12,000 members. The existence of small and separate trade union organisations, however, hampered the workers' movement as a whole. Progressive workers understood that the efforts of all workers' organisations must be united. As a result, in 1872, in Prague, for the first time in the history of the Czech workers' movement, a trade union uniting all the organisations of a single trade was organised. This was the Central Association of the Machine Builders of Bohemia, headed by a Central Committee which was elected at a convention attended by 1,500 delegates.

By the 1890s, the trade union movement in Austria-Hungary was united on a nation-wide scale. In 1892, the first general Austrian Trade Union of Metal Workers, including Czech workers, was organised.

In addition, the early 1890s saw attempts to organise

an independent Czech trade union centre, which culminated in the formation of the Czech Trade Union in 1897, when 108 delegates representing 90 organisations argued in favour of organising a national trade union centre. Nonetheless, the Czech trade unions did not agree to complete separation from the Austrian trade union movement.

During this period, despite the fact that unity in the workers' movement was imperative, a split in the trade union movement was beginning to show; there was lack of unity even in the central organs of the trade union movement in Vienna. As a consequence of disarray in the trade unions, a strike staged in 1900 failed to achieve all its goals, despite the fact that about 80,000 miners went out. They did succeed, however, in establishing a nine-hour working day. A significant role in the split of the trade union movement was played by the separatist nationalist policy pursued by the leaders of the Czech trade union movement.

This policy was condemned by the Fourth International Conference of Central Trade Unions held in Amsterdam in 1905, and again in 1910, at a trade union congress in Copenhagen. In that same year, the International Socialist Congress in Copenhagen passed a resolution condemning the actions of the Czech trade union centre and the Czech party. In his article "Separatists in Russia and Separatists in Austria", Lenin wrote: "In the international working-class movement, the question of separatism came to the front most urgently in 1910, at the Copenhagen Congress. The *Czechs* came forward as separatists in Austria, and destroyed the unity that had existed previously between the Czech and German workers. The International Congress at Copenhagen *unanimously* condemned separatism, but the Czechs have unfortunately remained separatists right up to the present."¹ The Czechs did not agree with the decision of the Copenhagen Congress and split off com-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 88.

pletely, breaking ties with the international trade union movement.

One might think that after the establishment of an independent Czechoslovak state in 1918 conditions for trade union activity should have become more favourable. As subsequent events showed, however, the trade union movement became even more fractionated. The policy of splitting the trade union movement, of keeping the trade unions fractionated, was supported by the bourgeoisie and its parties, for it was in the bourgeoisie's interest to weaken the proletariat.

**The Penetration of Marxism
into the Working-Class Movement
and the Emergence of Social-Democratic Organisations**

The penetration of Marxism into Bohemia and Slovakia began in the second half of the 19th century. A certain role in this was played by the Social-Democratic Party and its leaders. In contrast to the trade union form of the workers' movement, which had to do basically with the economic struggle, the Social-Democratic movement was primarily a political working-class movement.

The Social-Democratic movement of the workers emerged considerably later than the trade union movement; it constituted the next step in the development of the Czech proletariat's class awareness. Social-Democratic organisations began to appear only in 1874. Czech workers made their first acquaintance with Marxist theory through the tireless propaganda efforts of the first outstanding members of the socialist movement in Czechoslovakia—Josef Boleslav Pecka, Ladislav Zápotocký and Josef Hibeš. They were the first men in Czechoslovakia to study the works of Marx and Engels and to acquaint the Czech working class with the great historical truth of Marxism. Their written works, published in the working-class press, indicate that as early as the beginning of the 1870s they were familiar with such

works of the founders of scientific communism as the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, *Capital* (translated chapters of which they had already begun to publish), and Marx's remarks on the Paris Commune. These men fought for the interests of the workers and tried to put Marxist ideas into practice—not only through the printed word, but also in their day-to-day political activity.

As Marxist ideas spread, large strikes took place in Brno, Northern Bohemia and elsewhere.

Under the influence of Marxist ideas and in connection with the growth of the workers' strike movement, a Czech Social-Democratic Party was formed in 1878 in Prague. At the time, however, the activity of the Social-Democrats was not yet widespread.

A struggle was taking place within the party over the political line to be followed and over the question of becoming or not becoming part of Austrian Social-Democracy. A general Social-Democratic Party of Austria-Hungary was formed on January 1, 1889, at a congress held in Geinfeld, and this party began to unite a greater part of the working class in Austria. The working class could now begin to wage a struggle with the bourgeoisie for the leading role in the nation, especially since the class interests of the bourgeoisie came into greater and greater conflict with national interests. Soon, however, a split occurred in the Austro-Hungarian Social-Democratic movement. In 1891, the Czech Social-Democrats quit the Austrian central party organisations and in 1893, in České Budějovice, an independent Czechoslovak Social-Democratic Party was formed. At its Second Congress, held in 1894 in the city of Brno, this party adopted its own programme.

Alarmed by the upsurge in the workers' movement and perceiving in Marxism a threat to their own existence the ruling circles instigated police persecution of Marxist propagandists. But this did not halt the growing influence of

Marxism in Bohemia, and the bourgeoisie was forced to alter its tactics and methods of struggle.

The bourgeoisie now sought to find some kind of "carrot" to supplement its use of the "stick", some method by which the workers would be given a false understanding of capitalism and be convinced that it could be improved through the "development" of bourgeois democracy. Bourgeois liberal ideology came to play this role; operating with demagogic phrases about unlimited "freedom" for all, it served the bourgeoisie as a more refined ideological method of influencing the masses than were the conservatism and clericalism that were predominant in the past. The only thing that could succeed at least to some degree in influencing the workers was a liberal ideology, an ideology which masked the anti-popular nature of capitalism with words about "humanism" and "democracy". For this reason, such an ideology posed a serious threat to the class interests of the proletariat. Masarykism assumed this role from the very beginning.

It should be noted also that the history of the Czech workers' movement had by that time entered into a period when the unity of the working class was seriously undermined by the labour aristocracy and the revolutionary leaders of the working class were hounded by the police.

Under these conditions, Masaryk and his followers succeeded in overriding the Social-Democratic leadership and directing the Czech workers' movement away from the path of revolutionary struggle against capitalism and onto the path of reformism.

The Czech bourgeoisie was attempting to "intercept", as it were, the penetration of Marxism into the Czechoslovak workers' movement. It made wide use of Masaryk's idealist, reactionary philosophy in its struggle against the working class and its proletarian revolutionary ideology. Masaryk and his adherents began to spread among Czechoslovak intellectuals many Marxist propositions, but in their own distorted interpretation. The bourgeoisie was thereby striv-

ing to penetrate the workers' movement ideologically, to sow scepticism about the strength of Marxist teaching and to disarm the proletariat in its struggle against capitalism. With the same aim the bourgeoisie pursued a policy of spurious humanism and phone democracy.

Police repression coupled with the bourgeois ideological offensive against Marxism had their deleterious effect on the ideological steadfastness of Czech Social-Democracy. The latter was already abandoning its Marxist positions, and at its Fifth Congress, in 1896, it made substantial concessions to revisionism as it went over, in many respects, to opportunist positions. From that point on, Masarykism came to have an increasing influence on the Czech workers' movement in general, and on Czech Social-Democracy in particular.

2. THE STRUGGLE WAGED BY FEUDAL REACTIONARIES AND THE CZECH BOURGEOISIE AGAINST THE WORKERS' MOVEMENT. THE EMERGENCE OF MASARYKISM

Masarykism as a Policy and Ideology of the Czech Bourgeoisie in the Imperialist Period

The period of bourgeois revolution in Austria ended with the establishment in 1867 of a dual Austro-Hungarian state and the adoption of the December constitution. The bourgeoisie had strengthened its position by compromising with feudal reaction; in subsequent years, many vestiges of feudalism remained untouched in Austria-Hungary. One of the most burning problems of the day was the unsolved national question. The bourgeoisie was unable to bring about the fulfilment of the basic national demands of the Czech people.

Meanwhile, the hope that in the course of the reforms of the 1860s a Czech national state would finally be established aroused great enthusiasm in the Czech people. This

enthusiasm was most fully manifested in the best works of the Czech national culture of that time, above all in the music of Smetana and the literary works connected with the National Theatre.

Immediately after 1867, the bourgeoisie began attempts to enter the ruling circles of the Hapsburg empire. With this in mind, the politicians of the Czech bourgeoisie who were connected with reactionary feudal strata made a fundamental deal with the government in 1871 which signified the bourgeoisie's capitulation to the Austro-Hungarian reactionary forces. Eight years later (1879), when the German Liberal Party was removed from power, Czech bourgeois deputies became members of the Imperial Council and supported one of the most reactionary of Austrian governments—the Taaffe government.

The Czech bourgeoisie was now playing up to the Emperor and Taaffe while, at the same time, trying to distract public attention from its disgraceful capitulation and even portraying itself as victor. To achieve the first goal, Czech authorities, headed by Minister of Justice Baron Pražak, participated zealously in the persecution of Socialists which the Taaffe government had launched. The Czech deputies gave loyal support to the government circles as they put through highly reactionary and unpopular measures, such as raising taxes to provide increased funds for the army, subordinating the schools to clerical reaction, shortening the length of school education, etc.

To achieve its second goal, the Czech bourgeoisie made demagogic use of a decree then issued concerning education in the Czech language. Although, in fact, this decree did not bring about substantial changes, the bourgeoisie pointed to it as its great accomplishment, focusing attention on the language question to distract public attention from the overall policy it was pursuing. Certain other measures were undertaken with the same aim, one of which was to divide Prague University into a German university and a Czech university. Under these conditions,

final decisions were made not by highly qualified people in the academic field, but primarily by politicians.

It was into this little world, full of complicated personal and factional interests, that Masaryk entered in the year 1882. Before coming to Prague, he had associated with people in reactionary Austrian society, ranging from the family of Le Monnier, the police chief of Brno, to circles of Viennese bankers, lawyers and high-ranking Austrian bureaucrats. In this environment, Masaryk grew as a sophisticated intellectual, a cosmopolitan, far removed from the life of the working people and the democratic culture of the Czech nation. Young Masaryk's socio-political views were greatly influenced by ideas of some members of the clergy, especially one father Proházka, who, in the late 1860s, tried to penetrate the workers' movement of Prague.

Masaryk's first step in his political career was to take part in a campaign to expose forgeries of *The Manuscripts*.¹ Shortly after the hullabaloo over this matter quieted down, Masaryk began negotiations with the most reactionary political group within the Czech bourgeoisie at that time—the Staroczech (Old Czech) Party. When these negotiations fell through, however, Masaryk established contact with another Czech bourgeois group—the Mladoczechs (Young Czechs). In contrast to the conservative Staroczechs, whose connections were with the large landowners and the

¹ Reference here is to Masaryk's participation in a polemic on the authenticity of the Královédvorský and Zelenohorský "manuscripts", which were published in 1817 and 1818 by Czech writer and poet V. Hanka, who claimed they were works of 9th-13th century national poetry. Careful study of the "manuscripts", however, made it increasingly clear that they were counterfeits. In the end, it was determined that Hanka himself had manufactured them in order to provide "confirmation" for his own theory about the existence of a developed Czech culture in that period.

Masaryk took an active part in this controversy in its final stages in 1886, proving the spuriousness of the "manuscripts" on the basis of a sociological and aesthetic analysis.

Masaryk's participation in sensational matters of this kind was used to spread the illusion that all of his views were progressive.

nobility, the Mladoczechs were a young industrial and kulak bourgeoisie, much more predatory and resourceful in implementing their demands. In 1891, Masaryk stepped into the political arena as a Mladoczech deputy.

The 1890s marked a new turning point in the development of society: capitalism entered the phase of imperialism, and with imperialism came an acute aggravation of all the contradictions that had characterised the situation in the Austro-Hungarian Empire as a consequence of the uncompleted bourgeois revolution. New contradictions also arose. From that time on, the basic factor in the historical development of Czechoslovakia was the workers' socialist movement. Beginning in 1890, it assumed unprecedented proportions as it involved an ever greater part of the proletariat.

In 1891, the Mladoczechs took over from the Staroczechs the function of representing the entire Czech bourgeoisie—but not for long. Contradictions in the bourgeois society waxed under imperialism. In the political sphere, one manifestation of these contradictions was the emergence of new political parties and new, more or less radical, trends and currents. Despite all their demagogy, in the late 1890s the Mladoczechs lost their support from the petty-bourgeois segments of the population and ended up representing only the Živnostenská Bank bourgeois group. The now much stronger kulak elements, who had actually brought Czech agrarian capital into being, organised themselves into an agrarian party. In the meantime, small, scattered groups sprang up within the bourgeois intelligentsia. The National Socialist Party, which had grown out of an ultra-reactionary group of "national workers" organised by Klofač, editor of the newspaper *Národní listy*, was now drawing its members from among the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie which was being ruined by imperialism.

Also connected with the cutting short of the bourgeois revolution was the fact that the anti-Austrian liberation movement of the oppressed working masses in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy had gained momentum, for imperial-

ism brought with it new and even harsher national oppression that penetrated deeper and deeper into all spheres of social life.

During the period of transition from capitalism to imperialism in Austria-Hungary, the balance of economic power between the Czech and German bourgeoisie was changing. The Czech bourgeoisie, already relatively strong economically at the end of the 19th century, had to struggle against its German competitor not only for the small Czech market, but for the leading positions in all of Austria-Hungary. It was interested, consequently, not in destroying the Hapsburg monarchy, but in strengthening it. Since the domestic Czech market was already in the hands of the German bourgeoisie, the Czech bourgeoisie found the new imperialist trends in Austria-Hungary very much to its liking, and it began to take a substantial part in the export of capital to more backward countries, primarily the Balkans. That is why the Czech bourgeoisie supported the Austro-Hungarian expansionist foreign policy which was directed against the Slavic peoples of the Balkans. It was interested in government orders, and, therefore, also supported the armament and preparation of Austria-Hungary for an imperialist war.

Apprehensive of the powerful workers' movement, the Czech bourgeoisie supported internal Austrian reaction and the state apparatus. Never wavering, it sought to use the popular mass movement to promote its own competitive struggle for the Czech market, especially when it could use nationalistic demagoguery as a means of "rendering harmless" the revolutionary strength of the popular masses. The Czech bourgeoisie—whose political orientation was alien to the traditions of national renaissance and the people's national movement which had always been directed against Austria-Hungary—was represented in one way or another in every Austrian government since 1899. Only by taking all this into account can we understand how and why Kramář, Švehla, Masaryk, Kłofač and other Czech bourgeois politi-

cians of the early 20th century carried on and developed the Staroczech-Mladoczech political traditions of the last third of the 19th century. Only by taking all this into account can we understand the real meaning of taking a "genuine interest in the fate of Austria", which Masaryk propagandised in the 1890s as the basic prerequisite to a successful Czech policy.

The disintegration of bourgeois society resulting from the growing contradictions of imperialism also manifested itself in the revival of old and the appearance of new and more refined forms of reactionary ideology aimed at giving the bourgeoisie greater influence over the working people. Working class discontent and the growing strength of workers' organisations were becoming increasingly dangerous to the bourgeoisie. It was at this time that Masaryk's ideology came to the fore, side by side with nationalistic, anti-Semitic and other reactionary movements, such as, for example, the "national workers" organisation and the clerical movement that played on the religious feelings of the people. Masaryk represented the more modern, more refined, more cosmopolitan bourgeoisie. In 1893, he broke with the Mladoczechs and began to criticise them, for their opportunism in respect to the Hapsburg monarchy repelled not only workers, but also broad segments of the nationally oppressed non-proletarian masses of the Czech people. By breaking with the Mladoczechs, Masaryk hoped to prepare the way for his playing essentially the same role in relation to the workers' revolutionary movement in his country as Bernstein and other revisionists played in Germany.

The objective precondition for the expansion of petty-bourgeois elements in the workers' movement in the late 19th century was the transition of capitalism to its imperialist stage and the consequent appearance in the ranks of the working class of a labour aristocracy, which acquired considerable influence over the trade unions and party branches. As a consequence, reformist opportunism began to spread through the workers' movement, and many forms

of bourgeois ideology that had already been exposed by Marx and Engels were revived. Advantage of this situation was taken by revisionists headed by Bernstein and, in the conditions extant in Bohemia, above all by bourgeois professor Masaryk, who exerted influence on the workers' movement along revisionist lines.

In the preceding period of his life—a time rich in events—Masaryk happened to live in the main centres of the workers' movement. In 1869, there was a bloody clash between workers and police in the city of Brno, where Masaryk was living at the time. In December of that same year he was in Vienna when thousands of workers staged a demonstration in that city in connection with the fight for suffrage. After this large demonstration came a period in which Viennese Socialists were persecuted. Nothing, however, could stop the growth of the workers' movement in the Austro-Hungarian capital.

The year 1873 saw the beginning of a severe and prolonged economic crisis in which hundreds of working people were thrown out of work to face poverty and hunger. At this time, the Social-Democratic movement began to develop rapidly in the Czech lands. But in the late 1870s, Bohemia also became the scene of intensified persecution of Socialists, which culminated, in 1882—just at the time Masaryk moved to Prague—in the arrest and illegal conviction of a large number of workers. These actions of the Austro-Hungarian monarchist authorities evoked strong protests from the Czech democratic community (for example, in 1886, I. Arbes ridiculed the policy of persecuting Socialists in a piece entitled "The Law on Exterminating Anarchists").

However, these developments evoked no protest from Masaryk, who had already perceived the danger that an organised Workers' Socialist Party posed to the bourgeoisie. During his stay in Leipzig, he had witnessed an election campaign in which German Social-Democracy had won out despite the Bismarckian persecution.

In the 1890s the workers' movement in Austria-Hungary became increasingly threatening to the bourgeoisie. Masaryk realised that open struggle was not always the best tactic in the fight against the Social-Democratic danger. This explains why, though he had never before shown an interest in the workers' movement, he did so now that he had become a deputy. He did not avoid contacts with Social-Democratic figures, did not refuse to organise lectures for workers, and was particularly active in the question of suffrage. Leipzig convinced Masaryk that suffrage posed no danger and that, on the contrary, it was dangerous to deny this right to the working class and thereby force it on to the road of uncontrolled struggle outside parliament. Also, the granting of suffrage to workers was an urgent democratic demand, and the fight for its satisfaction became the major political task of the Social-Democrats in Austria-Hungary in the 1890s. Being for or against suffrage was at that time like a criterion of membership or non-membership in the Social-Democratic Party. Masaryk's positive views on suffrage enabled him to win the sympathy of a part of the Socialists of that time. Nor did he break his connection with the working class in 1893, when he divested himself of his deputy powers and broke with the Mladoczechs, who had openly begun (in place of the Staroczechs) to play the role of lackeys to the Austro-Hungarian government circles.

Having split with the Mladoczechs, Masaryk entered the period of his greatest prewar political activity. His well-known works—*Our Present Crisis*, *The Czech Question*, *Jan Hus*, *Karel Havlíček*, *Palacký's Idea of the Czech Nation* and others—came out one after another. They were all political works that were not based on scientific research, but written with the idea of gaining for him, Masaryk, the reputation as a national thinker and to assure him a leading place in public life. In these works, as in other books, Masaryk distorted Czech history by ignoring its class content and stressing the "unity" of the people.

Masarykism as the Falsification and Revision of Marxism

For a long time it was asserted that Masaryk was the first to acquaint the Czech public with Marxism. Now, however, on the basis of a thorough study of the events of the last third of the 19th century and especially of the workers' movement of that period, we see that this was one of the many legends built around Masaryk.

In all of his works Masaryk set out to distort and falsify Marxist philosophy, political economy and socialism rather than to present them objectively. One has only to glance at the titles of his works to see that Masaryk's basic aim was to revise and criticise Marxism.

Masaryk's press organs—*Čas* (*Time*), and, particularly, *Naše doba* (*Our Epoch*)—became the chief purveyors of information to the Czech public on the *revisionist* criticism of Marxism engaged in since the end of the 19th century mainly by German Social-Democrats, but also by some Socialists in other countries. The primary motive behind all the comment and information printed in Masaryk's press organs about the current development of socialism was to use *revisionism* as evidence that "young" Marxists allegedly rejected materialism and took issue with Marx and Engels. In an article entitled "Old Socialism and Fabianism", appearing in *Čas* in 1896, Masaryk vilified basic Marxist propositions, including "Workers of All Countries, Unite!", and criticised the revolutionary side of Marxism, saying that it was applicable to the mid-19th century, but now obsolete.

In 1898, Masaryk summed up all of his previous statements preaching international *revisionism* in a book entitled *The Social Question*. He used that book as a vehicle for denigrating socialism and passing off revisionism—which was, in fact, the fruit of the crisis in bourgeois society and bourgeois ideology in the era of imperialism—as the "crisis of Marxism". In the following year Bernstein published his book, *The Prerequisites of Socialism and the Tasks of Social-Democracy*, in which he summed up all of his previously

expounded revisionist views. Masaryk greeted this book enthusiastically. In an article, "On the Crisis of Marxism", appearing in the magazine *Naše doba* he wrote: "Bernstein's book fully confirms my opinion of Marxism. I could not ask for fuller confirmation. Bernstein comes out against revolution; he wants Marxists to become a social-reformist party (of course, more radical than other parties), and he does not reject compromise with other kindred parties.... In a word, in his basic scientific propositions, Bernstein departs from Marxism." The only fault Masaryk could find with Bernstein was that he formulated his arguments against Marxism too carefully and not decisively enough, thereby giving Kautsky a chance to initiate a polemic with him.¹

In another book, *Česká otázka* (*The Czech Question*), just as in *The Social Question*, Masaryk spread his slanderous and reactionary nationalistic statements about Marx's alleged hostility towards the Czechs and especially about his "anti-Czech" position in 1848. Knowing that large segments of the working people at that time were not fully acquainted with the works of the Marxist classics, he counterposed Engels to Marx and used Engels' prestige among Czech workers in an attempt to strengthen reactionary Czech bourgeois nationalism. This, then, was how in the last decade of the 19th century, Masaryk, taking advantage of the ideological slump in which Social-Democracy found itself and of spreading reformism, began to exert his influence on the workers' movement and to guide it along the lines of his pseudo-humanism in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

Another myth about Masaryk was that he was the father of objective Czech research on Russia and her problems. Nothing could be further from the truth. His press organs, *Čas* and *Naše doba*, always printed detailed information about every obscure revisionist in Western Europe, but never a

¹ Zdeněk Šolle, "The Influence of Masarykism on the Czech Labour Movement in the Late 19th Century", *Nová mysl*, No. 3, 1954.

word about the brilliant Marxist works which young Lenin had begun publishing since 1894. Especially after the first Russian revolution, Masaryk became one of the chief slanderers of Russian revolutionaries and of Russians in general, whom he portrayed as a backward people.¹

Masarykism—a specifically *Czech variety of international revisionism*—penetrated the workers' movement in other ways, too, in addition to the writings of Masaryk and his followers. In the second half of the 1890s, the Social-Democratic leadership was seized by new people who had come from the disintegrating radical petty-bourgeois movement of the "Progressists" and who represented the increasingly strong labour aristocracy. Many direct disciples of Masaryk also assumed leadership roles in the Social-Democratic Party.

At the Fifth Congress of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party, held in Prague in 1896, the influence of these members of the new strata of the workers' movement that were infected with petty-bourgeois ideology manifested itself primarily in the many concessions which Social-Democracy made to bourgeois nationalism. Masaryk's *Čas* greeted that congress with enthusiasm, flattered the Social-Democrats and emphasised: "Our Social-Democracy deserves special mention! While an excessively numerous Jewish element is immediately noticeable among the Germans, public opinion—which we hold dear—has no idea how national our organisation is. Only with repugnance could one read the false statement in the newspaper *Národní listy* on April 9 that 'the Social-Democrats are clearly trying to destroy all vestiges of national feeling among their adherents'. Whoever wrote that has never been among Social-Democrats."²

Similarly, Masaryk lauded the bourgeois-nationalistic statements made by Social-Democrats in 1897. Certain cosmopolitan tendencies cropped up in the Austrian Social-

¹ Zdeněk Šolle, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

² *Ibid.*

Democrats' policies at that time, and this gave the Czech bourgeoisie—represented mainly by the Mladoczechs—and their ultra-reactionary agents (the so-called national workers) the chance to attack the workers' organisation. Then Masaryk's *Čas* came out "in defence" of the Social-Democrats and against the attacks of the Mladoczechs and the "national workers". But not out of sympathy for the working class, of course, but because Masaryk immediately realised that crude nationalistic attacks only united the proletariat into a single militant international front, while the cosmopolitanism of the Social-Democratic leadership automatically strengthened bourgeois-nationalistic reaction, especially within the ranks of the nationally oppressed Czech workers.

The decline of Social-Democracy and the influence of Masaryk's reformist adherents in the workers' movement manifested themselves fully when the national liberation movement reached a particularly high peak right after the first Russian revolution in 1905. It was then that Masaryk's supporters, who had taken over the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party, bent every effort to distract the workers "so that their minds were not occupied only with hunger and need", as Masaryk himself, in the 1890s, defined the meaning of his speeches to striking workers in Prague and Kladno.

On Masaryk's initiative, a Workers' Academy was established in 1896, its purpose being to implant in workers, instead of militant revolutionary enthusiasm, a "hopeless awareness of their cultural inadequacy" and thereby divert them from the path of revolutionary struggle onto the path of "self-education and enlightenment". This was also the idea behind the pseudo-theoretical articles published by Masaryk's followers in the Social-Democratic magazine *Akademie*.

Thus, in respect to the working class and its ideology—Marxism—Masaryk played a reactionary role from the very beginning of his political career. Moving about within bourgeois society since his early years, he lived, breathed and

championed the interests of the bourgeoisie, while his attitude towards the workers' movement was hostile. Realising much sooner than did other Czech bourgeois politicians the best way to deal with the danger of an increasingly potent proletariat, Masaryk meddled in the Czech workers' movement and found a response among the labour aristocracy which had boosted its influence in the workers' movement in the late 19th century, as capitalism moved into its imperialist phase. All this, in conjunction with a number of other circumstances, hampered the proletariat's struggle against the bourgeoisie to overthrow the capitalist system. Masaryk's influence among workers made it easier for him than for anyone else from the bourgeoisie to deflect the labour movement from a revolutionary path. He took advantage of the ideological decline of the Social-Democratic Party and not only criticised Marxism in his writings, but tried to influence Social-Democracy directly. Masaryk wanted to restrict the activity of the Social-Democratic Party to "purely labour" issues, that is, to the struggle for reforms that would in no way jeopardise the capitalist system. This was the "progress" that distinguished Masaryk, the "humanist and friend of the workers", from the primitively reactionary Mladoczech politicians. Being a representative of the ruling classes, however, Masaryk could, under the circumstances then prevailing in the social development of Czechoslovakia, play a leading role in the struggle against the working class much more subtly than the less resourceful politicians of Kramář's ilk.

At first, Masaryk's liberal activity and propaganda were not always understood by members of the ruling classes, who preferred the standard conservative methods. It was not that Masaryk was encroaching upon their interests, but simply that they did not understand that complicated manoeuvring and effective phraseology were now needed to defend the existing system. Later, however, they were grateful to Masaryk, and at the time of the bourgeois republic many of his former "enemies" declared themselves to be

Masaryk's followers. Indeed, from the mid-19th century on, conservatism and liberalism were merely varieties of ruling class, primarily bourgeois, ideology. Conservatives and liberals, Pekář and Masaryk, despite their purely superficial differences, in essence championed the interests of the same class and differed only in their choice of the way in which these interests should be protected.

The bourgeoisie needed liberal ideologists who could, by talking about individual faults in the existing system and calling for insignificant reforms, attract the workers' attention and divert them from revolutionary struggle. Masaryk filled this need better than any other representative of the bourgeoisie. He preached his views on "humanism" and "democracy"—views which directly protected the interests of the bourgeoisie—from the very beginning of his career, and especially after 1882, when he began to lecture at the University of Prague.

The Communists of Czechoslovakia have always looked upon Masaryk as a bourgeois ideologist and politician; they have always considered him an enemy of Marxism-Leninism, an enemy of scientific socialism, an enemy of the communist world outlook. Masaryk took a hostile stand towards the revolutionary teaching of the working class in 1898, in *The Social Question*, an ideological treatise directed against the teaching of Marx and Engels and designed to do the same for Social-Democratic opportunism and revisionism in Czechoslovakia as Eduard Bernstein's writings did for it on an international scale. Masaryk was hostile to Lenin's teaching and to the Russian Bolshevik Party in his work, *Russia and Europe*, published in 1913.

Czech Social-Democracy co-operated with Masaryk long before the First World War, and this only confirms the fact of opportunism in the Czech Social-Democratic leadership. Prior to the First World War, Masaryk and the Czech Social-Democratic opportunists were in agreement in acknowledging the necessity of preserving the Austro-Hungarian monarchy; both rejected the idea of establishing an independent

Czechoslovak state and ignored the national aspirations of the Czechoslovak people.

In the imperialist period, the Czech bourgeoisie succeeded in drawing Right-wing Social-Democracy over to the defence of capitalist interests. In view of the prevailing opportunism in the parties of the Second International, Masarykism was able to split the Social-Democratic Party of Czechoslovakia prior to the advent of the revolutionary storms that broke out due to the impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution. With the help of Masarykism, the Czech bourgeoisie implanted the idea of nationalism in the broad segments of the Czech and Slovak public during the period of bourgeois Czechoslovakia. During Masaryk's presidency, his long-standing connection with Right-wing Social-Democrats became especially evident.

Throughout the years of bourgeois Czechoslovakia, its ruling circles strove to "educate" the Czechoslovak people in the spirit of the bourgeois legend about Masaryk and his "democratism and humanism".

The repressive measures, which included executions, undertaken in December 1920 on Masaryk's initiative against the revolutionary proletariat, established once and for all that relations between Masaryk and the communist movement were, from a class point of view, irreconcilable.

From the outset, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia stood opposed to Masaryk's policy and ideology, always seeing in him a political and ideological representative of the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie and, above all, a close ally of finance capital. Masaryk was also an enemy of the Soviet Union and took an active part in anti-Soviet plots by giving material support to Russian counter-revolutionary emigrants and terrorists, such as, for example, Savinkov.

Throughout the Czechoslovak bourgeois republic's existence, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia never took a positive position in relation to Masarykism.

**The Class Bias of Masarykism
in Philosophy and Sociology**

Masarykism emerged and developed as an ideology of the Czech bourgeoisie in the period of imperialism, when the bourgeoisie had already become a reactionary force and the proletariat had become an independent class, with its own organisations—trade unions and political parties—and its own ideology. The bourgeoisie and its ideologists no longer directed all their efforts against the forces of feudalism, as had been the case during the French Revolution of 1789-1794; on the contrary, they fought in alliance with those forces *against the working class and its ideology*, above all against *Marxism*. This is how the reactionary nature of the bourgeoisie and its ideology manifested itself in the period of imperialism. *Masarykism* was *revisionism* and *reformism*, an attempt to distort Marxist teaching, particularly the theory of scientific socialism, while feigning an "objective" attitude towards Marxism.

The Czech bourgeoisie attempted to portray Masaryk's views as constituting a national Czech ideology having no class character of any kind and being impartial and objective. Masaryk himself bent no little effort in his writings to portray his views as forming a supra-party and supra-class ideology. In his first major work, *The Social Question*, he strove to contrast himself to party writers and to separate himself from them.¹

¹ Masaryk wrote: "In this work, I set myself the task of explaining the meaning of Marxism as a philosophical and sociological system. So far, only the economic aspect of Marxism has been subjected to analysis and, in particular, certain of its slogans and teachings have been studied. For example, there is discussion on the question of whether communism is possible or not. But even here an account of Marx's entire teaching on communism is not given. For *party* writers this is quite understandable; *but for me*, it is important to give an account of the teachings of Marx and Engels in their entirety and in their interconnection [emphasis added—M.S.]" See *Otázka sociální*, Praha, 1946, p. IX.

He also asserted that philosophy, sociology and other social sciences should not be an expression of partisan views or the instruments of party struggle; they should be impartial. He tried to make it look as though his own views stood above any class or party struggle, above any class ideology. In particular, in an attempt to cast doubt as to the scientific validity of Marxism, Masaryk argued that "Marx was first of all a party man and only a party man. The feeling of universal solidarity is unknown to him."¹

Behind Masaryk's own assertions, however, one may clearly discern the struggle of parties in philosophy—a struggle which in the final count expresses the trends and ideologies of antagonistic classes. Lenin pointed out: "Recent philosophy is as partisan as was philosophy two thousand years ago. The contending parties are essentially—although this is concealed by a pseudo-erudite quackery of new terms or by a weak-minded non-partisanship—materialism and idealism. The latter is merely a subtle, refined form of fideism, which stands fully armed, commands vast organisations and steadily continues to exercise influence on the masses, turning the slightest vacillation in philosophical thought to its own advantage."²

This assessment fully applies to Masarykism.

The thing that immediately exposes the *class nature* of Masaryk's views is that he chose *Marxism*, the proletarian ideology, as the subject of his revisionist criticism.

That his aim was specifically *revision* and criticism of Marxism was stated by Masaryk himself in his works. In *The Social Question*, for example, he wrote: "Concretely and from a practical point of view, the social question at present is the question of socialism, and socialism in our country is predominantly Marxism. That is why we must take up the question of Marxism. In this, my first study, I restrict myself to the exposition and *analysis* of the sociological and philo-

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 261.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 358.

sophical foundations of Marxism [emphasis added—M.S.]."¹

As can be seen from Masaryk's own words, of all socialist teachings he limited himself to a criticism of Marxism. And this was not accidental, because Marxism is precisely a *proletarian* and *scientific* ideology. Other socialist trends pose no real class danger to the bourgeoisie and its dominance, since they are either (a) merely utopian in nature and, therefore, unrealisable, or (b) of a basically petty-bourgeois nature and, therefore, from a class standpoint, not dangerous to the bourgeoisie, or (c) a combination of the two. Only Marxism is a genuinely scientific ideology of the *working class* and, therefore, poses a mortal danger to the bourgeoisie from a class standpoint, for it alone places socialism on the practical plane of the class struggle of the working class, socialist revolution and elimination of capitalism, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the building of a socialist and communist society. Any other kind of socialism amounts to a utopia, ultimately used in the struggle to preserve capitalism. This, then, explains why Masaryk, as an ideologist of the bourgeoisie, chose Marxism and not some other socialist trend for his revisionist criticism.

Wishing, however, to portray his revisionist criticism of Marxism as objective and scientific, Masaryk claimed that he strove to examine Marx and Engels as impartially and factually as possible.² In fact, he was far from being impartial; his hostility towards Marxism and his continuous struggle against it permeated all of his works. To show that this was the case requires an examination of Masaryk's views on fundamental philosophical and sociological questions, and this is what the author will attempt to do in the present book.

The class viewpoint of Masarykism manifests itself in the struggle against materialism in general and against Marxist materialism in particular—against the Marxist

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 3.

² Ibid., Vol. II, p. 261.

theory of knowledge; against materialist dialectics; against the principal propositions of historical materialism on the role of the material conditions of the life of society as the basis of social being; against Marx's teaching on economics, especially on the question of surplus value; against the Marxist theory of the class struggle and socialist revolution; etc. Let us here deal briefly with Masaryk's view of the class struggle and his theory of class collaboration.

Marx, who defended the proletarian and only scientific viewpoint regarding the motive forces of historical development in an exploitative society, stated that class struggle and social revolution are natural phenomena in the transition to a new and higher system. They lead, in particular, to the elimination of the capitalist system and the establishment of working-class power and a socialist social system. But Masaryk stressed something else entirely. Unable to deny the existence of the class struggle—for if he did, he would have to *openly* oppose the interests of the working class, including its interests in economic struggle—Masaryk advocated class collaboration, and, moreover, he came out in defence of the monarchy and the feudalists in Austria-Hungary. Here are a few of his statements on this score which are related to his revision of Marx's theory of the class struggle. "I state with confidence," he wrote, "that people belonging to different classes also have a feeling of mutuality, that generally speaking there is a feeling of honest humaneness among people and among classes.... I say that even *the worker*, for example, realises that his interests are to a large extent *identical* to the interests of *the employer*.... I say that the struggle is not at all what Marx describes it as being, that its meaning is different from that ascribed to it by Marx. Even when economic development is carefully analysed, it appears in a different light, that is, not at all how Marx presented it."¹ Masaryk asserted further that the emancipation of the peasants in Austria and in

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 237-38.

Bohemia did not take place only as a consequence of the peasants' struggle against the landowners; that *it did not take place against the will of the landowners; that on the contrary, some of them, and particularly the Crown, looked upon emancipation with favour; and that absolutist state power demanded emancipation of the peasants even against the will of many landowners. Thus, he maintained, this emancipation was not solely the result of struggle.*¹

This clearly shows what kind of a "non-partisan", "supra-party" and "scientific" approach Masaryk took in attacking Marx's theory of the class struggle. We see that Masaryk undertook to revise the theory of the class struggle and advanced the theory of class collaboration in order to portray the absolutist feudal monarchy in Austria-Hungary as the *instigator* of social progress. As for the theory of class collaboration, it was just as obviously a theory for preserving the prevailing system, since it proposed co-operation within the framework of the existing system with the retention of the ruling and the exploited classes.

Masarykism is in no way a supra-class ideology. It is, rather, an ideology of class exploitation, an ideology of subordinating the working class to the interests of capitalist exploitation. Hence, on the subject of the class struggle Masarykism is more reactionary and more anti-scientific than, for example, the views of such 19th century bourgeois historians as Thierry, Guizot and Mignet, who lived considerably earlier than Masaryk, but recognised the class struggle as a motive factor in social development.

In the 1930s, Zdeněk Nejedlý, who knew Masaryk before the First World War when Masaryk was still a university professor, revealed, on the basis of exceedingly rich factual material, the social roots, philosophical essence and class orientation of Masaryk's activity. It was no accident that Nejedlý chose Masaryk as the subject of a monograph in

¹ Ibid., p. 239.

which he wanted to present a picture of the decline in the bourgeois period in Czechoslovak history. In this monograph it was not Masaryk, the scholar, but Masaryk, the politician. It was not Masaryk, friend of the working class, but Masaryk, enemy of socialism, not only during his presidency, but from the outset of his academic activity in Prague in the 1880s. Such was the image of Masaryk which Nejedlý presented during the pre-Munich years of the republic to counter-balance the Social-Democratic demagoguery that described Masaryk as the son of a worker, the vanquisher of the Hapsburgs and a friend of the socialistically minded working class.

Nejedlý also exposed the scientific worthlessness of Masaryk's literary efforts. Even before the First World War Nejedlý had pointed out—in a critical study, entitled *The Dispute About the Meaning of Czech History*—that Masaryk's description of the Czech society and its development was invalid and pseudohistorical. He came to the same conclusion again after the First World War in his review of Masaryk's book *Světová revoluce* (*World Revolution*) and in a large monograph on Masaryk relating to his earlier works, *Sebevražda* (*Suicide*) and *Základové konkrétní logiky* (*Essay on Concrete Logic*). Nejedlý showed that as a *researcher* Masaryk was not original and always remained an *unprincipled eclectic*.

In his revisionist struggle against Marxism, Masaryk used somewhat modernised versions of every kind of reactionary ideology of the past: various kinds of philosophical idealism and agnosticism, religion and various brands of feudal-monarchist ideology. He armed himself with the idealism of Plato and Hegel and the agnosticism of Kant and Hume for the struggle against Marxism in the sphere of philosophy, while in the sphere of sociology he brought in the Christian religion and other religious teachings. Finally, he declared that Marxism itself was a kind of religion and proposed to replace Marxism with Masarykism—also as a religion, but more modern.

All these aspects of Masarykism were extremely reactionary and out of line even with the bourgeois philosophy of enlightenment which had prevailed when the bourgeoisie was just rising to dominance, particularly during the years immediately prior to the French Revolution of 1789-1794. At that time, bourgeois ideologists were *atheists* in faith and *revolutionaries* in the struggle against feudal ideology and the feudal system in general. The following is the classic characterisation, given by Engels, of the French Enlighteners as bourgeois ideologists: "The great men, who in France prepared men's minds for the coming *revolution*, were *themselves extreme revolutionists*. They recognised no external authority of any kind whatever. *Religion, natural science, society, political institutions—everything* was subjected to the most *unsparing criticism*... [emphasis added—M.S.]."¹

Such were the ideologists of bourgeois nations in the period when the capitalist mode of production was being established. But Masarykism, in its struggle against the proletarian revolution, went so far as to support unlimited monarchist state power, alliance with the landowners and alliance with religion.

¹ F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 25.

CHAPTER 2

CRITIQUE OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF MASARYKISM

According to Marxist-Leninist theory, the history of philosophy is the history of the struggle between materialism and idealism. In examining Masarykism, we find this assertion clearly corroborated, although Masaryk himself, for demagogic reasons, claimed he stood outside of this struggle.

In its philosophical content Masarykism is above all *struggle* against *materialism* in general and the *revisionist criticism of Marxist* philosophy in particular. In the sphere of philosophy, therefore, Masarykism is primarily criticism of materialism and materialist dialectics. Plekhanov was quite justified in pointing out in his article "About Masaryk's Book" that *The Social Question* revealed "the *psychology* of the '*critics*' who hide behind trite phrases about the harmfulness of orthodoxy, about the need to go forward ... pardon —to turn back, and so on and so forth".¹

It should be added that both the criticism of materialist philosophy and the "independent" philosophical views contained in Masarykism basically consist of unsubstantiated idealist assertions, at times quite absurd, which are not intended for understanding, but for faith.

Masaryk's struggle against materialism begins with the

¹ G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 669.

concepts of philosophy and philosophical materialism. We shall, therefore, use this as the starting point for our examination of the philosophical views of Masarykism.

1. DISTORTION OF THE CONCEPTS OF PHILOSOPHY AND PHILOSOPHICAL MATERIALISM BY MASARYKISM

In his book *The Social Question*, Masaryk argued against an understanding of philosophy as a scientific view of the world which manifests itself and finds confirmation in the various sciences. In discussing Engels' views on philosophy, for example, he wrote that sometimes Engels said that philosophy had ceased to exist and that, generally speaking, there was no longer philosophy, but simply a world outlook which must seek confirmation and manifest itself not in a *science of sciences* standing apart, but within the positive sciences.¹ But in actual fact, in his work against Dühring Engels states that of the *former* philosophy there still survives one independent part, the theory of thought and its laws—formal logic and dialectics, and that everything else is subsumed in the positive science of nature and history. In his work on Feuerbach, he says even more definitely that for philosophy, which has been expelled from nature and history, there remains the realm of pure thought, the theory of the laws of the thought process itself, logic and dialectics.

As we can see, Engels spoke against the *former* philosophy, the philosophy that claimed to be the *science of sciences*, and not against philosophy altogether. Philosophy, as Engels understood it, is a scientific view of the world which cannot take the place of all the rest of the sciences. When Masaryk quoted Engels' propositions, however, he failed to note the new and genuinely revolutionary change in the understanding of philosophy that had been introduced by Marx and

¹ See Masaryk, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 98.

Engels. He approached the conception of philosophy from positions of the *former* philosophy—the *science of sciences*. And this is what made Masaryk's views on philosophy itself reactionary; he pulled back and looked at the new and genuinely scientific views on philosophy through the eyeglass of the preceding stage of the development of philosophy.

Masaryk also repeated his accusations against dialectical and historical materialism in other parts of his book, always with the aim of distorting Marxist philosophical materialism and materialist dialectics. He even went so far as to perceive positivism in the Marxist understanding of philosophy as a scientific view of the world.

"Marx and Engels," he wrote, "speak of 'metaphysics' and 'ideology' in the same way as do the positivists: they contrast materialist dialectics with metaphysics in a positivist way. Engels ultra-positivistically rejects philosophy and puts the positive sciences in its place."¹

In general, to contrast philosophy as a scientific view of the world with social and natural sciences, as Masaryk did, is completely untenable. Can philosophy be scientific if its expression and confirmation is not found in the concrete sciences? No, it cannot. It is also totally incorrect to say that Engels rejected philosophy. Engels rejected philosophy only in the sense of its being a *science of sciences*, but accepted philosophy in the sense of its being a *scientific* world outlook. In this sense, Marx and Engels did not reject philosophy, but, on the contrary, created a new, truly scientific philosophy, namely, dialectical and historical materialism. Indeed, Masaryk himself knew and understood this perfectly well, for did he not call his book *The Philosophical and Sociological Foundations of Marxism. Studies on the Social Question*...? What, one might ask, did Masaryk criticise and "present" if, in his opinion, Engels had rejected philosophy altogether? Clearly, we have here an obvious distortion of Marxist views on philosophy.

¹ Masaryk, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-87.

Consequently, instead of trying to analyse and comprehend the Marxist understanding of philosophy, Masaryk chose to distort the views of Marx and Engels, arguing from positions of a stage in the history of philosophy that had long passed. Masaryk accused Marx and Engels of rejecting philosophy and of having elements of positivism in their own views primarily because of their *materialism* and *materialist dialectics*. In this connection, he wrote: "For justification of his *materialism*, Engels refers to positivism and believes that no philosophy of any kind is necessary, that positive knowledge and positive sciences are enough [emphasis added—M.S.]."¹

Now there is a good example of a really "objective" and "impartial" presentation of Marxism and a "scientific" analysis of it! Engels, of course, never referred to positivism to justify philosophical materialism; in the quotation given above we have another example of Masaryk's distortion of the views of Marx and Engels. Repetition of unsubstantiated accusations was one of the devices used in Masaryk's revisionist criticism of materialism. But unsubstantiated criticism is, of course, not criticism at all. This aspect of Masaryk's "criticism" was aptly exposed by Plekhanov in his article "About Masaryk's Book". He wrote that from Masaryk's point of view "Marx (just like Engels) was not only a *materialist*, but also a *positivist*, without suspecting it himself".²

"What exactly is positivism?" Plekhanov asked further. "Mr. Masaryk does not define this philosophical concept, so all that is left for us to do on this account is to *guess*. For example, Engels appears to him to be a *positivist* when he says: '...to comprehend the real world—nature and history—just as it presents itself to everyone who approaches it free from preconceived idealist crotchets ... mercilessly to sacrifice every idealist crotchet which

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., pp. 84-85.

² G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 678.

could not be brought into harmony with the facts conceived in their own and not in a fantastic interconnection. And materialism means nothing more than this.' Evidently, the professor thinks that a materialist could not speak in this manner. He thinks this because he is not acquainted with materialism. One can find plenty of this kind of 'positivism' in the works of the French materialists of the 18th century (see, for example, the end of the sixth chapter of the second part of *Système de la nature*). But this is of no concern to the professor. He doesn't want to know anything about materialism. And, as a matter of fact, he doesn't."¹

Indeed, Masaryk not only did not give a definition of positivism, but was far from understanding Marx's and Engels' connection, not with positivism, but with the concrete scientific disciplines. Positivism is an anti-scientific philosophy, for it denies the necessity of a scientific world outlook concerning the general laws of the development of nature, society and human thought. Positivism seeks the elimination of a *world outlook per se*, and tries to replace it with concrete sciences. Nothing like this is found in Marxism; Marx and Engels not only upheld the need for philosophy as a scientific world outlook, but actually developed such a philosophy—dialectical and historical materialism. Generally speaking, any attempt to eliminate a world outlook from the ideological life of society is an anti-scientific and futile effort. In any concrete field of knowledge people do not approach the study of phenomena unconsciously. It is precisely this conscious selection of specific phenomena for study and this conscious approach in drawing conclusions from and interpreting the results of research, that presuppose a world outlook, which every researcher has, no matter what concrete science he is working in. Therefore, because positivism denies the necessity of a world outlook on the basis of the fact that there are concrete sciences, it is untenable from both the practical and the theoretical standpoints.

¹ G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., pp. 678-79.

To deny the necessity of a general world outlook, as positivism does, is one thing, but it is quite another thing to recognise, as Marxist philosophy does, not only that a world outlook is necessary, but that it must be connected with the natural and social sciences. Without such a connection no world outlook could be called scientific.

But this was just what frightened Masaryk—that Marx's materialism was a truly scientific world outlook, a world outlook which found its expression and confirmation in the natural and social sciences. In other words, what really frightened him was that the Marxist philosophy had natural science and social science foundations. It was precisely the *scientific nature* of Marxist philosophy and, consequently, its *practical* role as a force for transformation, that so irked Masaryk. He bent every effort to distort the connection between Marxist philosophy and the concrete sciences and had no wish to recognise the fact that this connection was in no way related to positivism. On the contrary, the necessity of a scientific world outlook as such was already a direct negation of positivism. Masaryk "did not notice" this in Marxism, and since he was frightened by the scientific character of Marxism, he was against the connection between *Marxist materialist philosophy* and *science*. *Materialism* was what was most unacceptable to him, and all the criticism that he directed at Marxist philosophy and all the basic distortions he was guilty of in describing this philosophy were connected with the struggle against *materialism*. In *The Social Question*, he wrote that he recognised "Marx's importance" but that he could "accept neither his materialism nor communism. On the contrary, I consider materialism in general, and Marxian materialism in particular, to be a scientifically impossible world outlook."¹

Masaryk's hatred of materialism becomes quite understandable from the *class* point of view of the bourgeoisie, for whom Masaryk, the ideologist, spoke. From this class point

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 118.

of view, it was the combination of materialism and socialism in Marxism that frightened him most. "In *The Holy Family*," Masaryk wrote, "he [Marx—M.S.] presents the history of materialism and tries to prove that materialism is the true and the only justified metaphysical basis of socialism and communism."¹ "We shall look into the question of whether and to what extent materialism serves as the foundation of communism."²

Masaryk was even willing to speak in positive terms of any "socialist" trend as long as it did not subscribe to Marxist materialism. He thought that socialism was getting closer and closer to philosophy, that profound social reform was impossible without a reformed world outlook, and that there could be no doubt as to the final phase of philosophical searchings: the Marxists would abandon materialism in all its forms because materialism was the *caput mortuum* of Marxism.

From a scientific and factual standpoint the above assertion is completely groundless. When and where have *Marxists* ever abandoned *materialism*? Obviously, this was pure invention and not a prognosis relative to Marxists. And how can one speak of Marxism without materialism, when, according to Masaryk's own statement, materialism is the *caput mortuum* of Marxism? Masaryk's assertions are clearly illogical and meaningless. Furthermore, in this somewhat later writing of his Masaryk no longer objected to treating philosophy as a world outlook, thus refuting his own revisionist criticism of Engels' understanding of philosophy.

But let us return to the question of materialism.

Why was it that Masaryk so zealously opposed not socialism in general, but the scientific socialism of Marx, the socialism founded on a materialist conception of history? And why was it precisely the *materialism* in socialist theory that bothered him most of all? This is not a difficult question

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 74.

² Ibid., p. 75.

to answer, since, first of all, *materialism* bears upon the *material, economic* foundations of the capitalist system. Marxist materialism attacks capitalist *private property*, the bedrock of the exploitative system. This explains why Masaryk, being an ideologist of the bourgeoisie, was so vehemently against the materialism of Marxist philosophy.

As noted earlier, the bourgeois class position on which Masaryk stood made him a revisionist not of any "socialist" theory, but specifically of Marxist scientific socialism. It is understandable, therefore, why Masaryk was afraid of the *connection* between Marxist *materialism* and *science* and rebuked Marxism of positivism. No less irritating to Masaryk was *materialist dialectics*, which he also tried to stick into the category of positivism. His real objection, of course, was not to positivism—it simply does not exist in Marxism—but to *revolution*, which *materialist* dialectics regards as a necessary and natural outcome of the struggle between antagonistic classes. In *The Social Question* Masaryk wrote: "Marx and Engels also adhere to reality when they preach revolution. Reality, after all, is just as relative as truth and error.... Uncritical positivism opens wide the door—and even the gate—to all kinds of arbitrariness; both historicism and positivism are nothing other than uncritical empiricism."¹

So the crux of the matter, it turns out, consists of *revolution*! That is why Masaryk thought materialism was bad and accused it of positivism and empiricism—and of being uncritical and so forth. As for something being uncritical, it is, of course, idealism, including Masaryk's, that is uncritical. Marxism, with its recognition of revolution, is a genuinely critical attitude to capitalist reality.

To understand the utter groundlessness of Masaryk's assertion that Marxism is guilty of positivism, let us examine a few more of his statements. He wrote in *The Social Question* that Marx and Engels held to natural science because

¹ Ibid., pp. 89-90.

that was the fashion with most philosophers, especially the positivists. Natural science, Masaryk said further, thanks to its method and its practical discoveries is, of late, most modern and pragmatic. This modern natural science has displaced the old *naturphilosophie* (although not completely, as demonstrated by, say, Darwinism), and is now recognised as a model, from the standpoint of methodology, for the spiritual sciences and for philosophy. "I have pointed to this fact before. . . . But besides this, Marx and Engels latched on to natural science much more out of *social* and *political* considerations. With its antagonism towards the *old* philosophy, primarily towards theology, natural science appeared to be a genuine, democratic and even *revolutionary* science; its practical successes gave it a special *social* charm and it became a socio-political force. In any case, Marx and Engels became worshippers of naturalism not for *scientific*, but for *political* and *social* reasons [emphasis added—M.S.]."¹

As we can see, Masaryk was disturbed by the connection between Marxism and natural science because of the *revolutionary* character of each. Specifically, the revolutionary nature of natural science manifests itself in relation to the *old* philosophy and *theology*, and the revolutionary character of Marxism manifests itself in relation to the social system. In Masaryk's opinion, this connection between Marxism and natural science did not stem from scientific considerations, but from the social and political considerations of the founders of Marxism. Such an assertion, however, was completely groundless; it was motivated not by *scientific* considerations, but by the *class* and *social* considerations of Masaryk himself. Standing on positions of metaphysics and idealism and defending theology, Masaryk came out against the connection between philosophy, or world outlook, and the concrete natural sciences, since such a connection helped to reveal the anti-scientific nature of theology and idealist

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., pp. 109-10.

philosophy. By objecting to the connection between *philosophy* and *natural science*, Masaryk was actually coming out against a scientifically based philosophy.

In fact, therefore, the connection between Marx's philosophical materialism and the concrete natural sciences—with the latter (as we shall show using the example of modern biology) fully confirming philosophical materialism—arises from *scientific* considerations—from the *scientific nature of each*. On the other hand, Masaryk's struggle against Marxist materialism and against its connection with the natural sciences turns out to be anti-scientific and dependent for support on theology and the old idealist philosophy. It is not "positivism" and some kind of social considerations that connect Marx's materialist philosophy with natural science, but the objective logic of scientific progress. This shows that Masarykism and not Marxism is unscientific; it reveals the reactionary class foundations of this doctrine which fights Marxism and natural science and supports theology and idealist philosophy.

Prompted not by scientific but by political and class considerations, Masaryk also tried to accuse Marxism of eclecticism. But, here again, his arguments were groundless, as was shown by Plekhanov. Let us cite part of Plekhanov's critical analysis.

"‘Thus,’" Plekhanov quoted Masaryk, "‘Marx's materialism is a rather complicated structure. It is quite obvious that Marx tried to make a synthesis of various views that had ripened in his time. An objective critic could hardly find this synthesis successful. The philosophy of Marx and Engels has all the earmarks of eclecticism....’" "So Marx and Engels turn out to be *eclectics*," Plekhanov writes further. "When we learned of this harsh verdict passed by Mr. ‘Objective Critic’, we were reminded of the deputy chairman of a criminal court who figures in an episode of Herzen's *Passing By* and who says: ‘What do you think I am, my dear fellow, some kind of a Turk or Jacobin who would make the fate of some unfortunate even worse just

out of laziness', etc. Herzen says in relation to this: 'Note that the Jacobins have been accused of everything, but the deputy chairman of a criminal court has the honour of accusing them of laziness.' In just the same way, the honour of accusing Marx and Engels of *philosophical eclecticism* belongs exclusively to Masaryk. We congratulate the professor of the Czech University: in any event, he doesn't lack *originality*."¹

Masaryk's accusing Marxism of eclecticism stemmed from social and class considerations, to which fact Plekhanov also made special reference in his article. Plekhanov pointed out that Masaryk contended that the philosophy of Marx and Engels suffered from "eclecticism" because "this philosophy is a veritable *algebra of revolution*". "If its revolutionary content could be expunged," Plekhanov continued, "then 'critics' such as Mr. Masaryk would immediately cease their attacks on it, and it would find many adherents among those educated elements of the petty bourgeoisie who are ready to champion *social reforms*, but are horrified at the very thought of *social revolution*."

"*'Reformation, nicht Revolution!'*" exclaims Mr. Masaryk in the 146th paragraph of his book. . . . He accompanies this significant exclamation with a sermon on the theme that 'without a real reform of our thinking and our morals we will, by means of revolution, drive off the devil only to replace him with the Beelzebub', etc. . . . And this sermon has all the greater effect on the feelings of the reader as the preacher piously raises his eyes to heaven."²

Masaryk stopped at nothing in his revisionist struggle against Marxist philosophical materialism, and this led him into logical inconsistencies and self-contradiction, which all the more reveal the groundlessness of his "criticism" and his utter lack of understanding of just what scientific materialism is and what vulgar materialism is.

¹ G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., pp. 669-70.

² Ibid., p. 676.

Masaryk recognised, without reservation, only vulgar materialism and thought it possible to consider the views of Marx and Engels as materialist only with certain reservations because Engels had criticised the vulgar materialism of Vogt and Büchner.

In other places, however, Masaryk considered Marx's philosophical materialism as pure materialism and even attached the label of "vulgar" materialism to it. In *The Social Question*, for example, he wrote that Marx and Engels "embrace materialism *in toto* and consistently, and with it its entire *fundus instructus* of impossibilities and inaccuracies. Neither Marx nor Engels has left the confines of vulgar realism and materialism."¹

These and other logically contradictory statements made by Masaryk about the materialism of Marx and Engels demonstrate the groundlessness of Masaryk's "presentation" and "criticism" of Marx's philosophical materialism. Moreover, as Plekhanov noted in his article,² they reveal the fact that Masaryk had not the slightest understanding of materialism.

The struggle that Masarykism waged against Marx's philosophical materialism clearly confirms the proposition that the history of philosophy is the history of the struggle between materialism and idealism. That partisanship in philosophy--the class struggle--always manifests itself in this struggle can also be seen from the example of Masarykism, as can the fact that idealism stops at nothing in its distortion of materialism. The struggle of Masarykism against materialism and the idea of revolution also shows that Masaryk spoke as an ideologist of the bourgeoisie, which had become reactionary in the period of imperialism, and that all of Masaryk's expatiation about the objectivity of his criticism and the non-partisanship of his views was pure bourgeois demagoguery.

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 79.

² G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 680.

2. THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION OF PHILOSOPHY AND THE IDEALIST POSITIONS OF MASARYKISM

Since Masaryk promised in his book not only to criticise, but also to give an account of Marxism, he could not, of course, side-step the fundamental question of philosophy. In this connection, he noted, referring to Engels' *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, that according to Marxism the highest and most important question in any philosophy was the relation of thinking to being, of the spirit to nature, of what existed first, spirit or nature, of whether the world had been created by God or had been in existence eternally. Philosophers were divided into two great camps—the idealists and the materialists—depending on how they answered this question. The idealists defended the primacy of spirit and hence ultimately assumed some kind of world creation; the materialists, on the other hand, considered nature as primary.¹

After presenting the Marxist view of the fundamental question of philosophy, Masaryk proceeded to express his disagreement with it: "The exclusive opposition of materialism and idealism is in itself strange: can all philosophical thought really be classified on the basis of these two broad categories?"²

A further examination of Masaryk's views, however, will show that it is just such a statement of the fundamental question of philosophy that is scientifically sound, and that Masaryk himself, being an idealist, fought specifically against materialism.

Masaryk was dead set against recognising thought and mental processes in general as the products of matter, and, specifically, of the human brain. He regarded such a viewpoint as vulgar materialism. At one point, for example, he cited Engels' proposition regarding thought and conscious-

¹ See Masaryk, op. cit., p. 76.

² Ibid., p. 79.

ness, and whence they come, namely, that they are products of the human brain and that man himself is a product of Nature which has been developed in and along with its environment; and that these products of the human brain, being in the last analysis also products of Nature, do not contradict the rest of Nature but are in correspondence with it. Masaryk's response to this was: "Why, this is vulgar materialism of the purest kind, and its vulgar popularisers will be very pleased with it..."¹

He also disagreed with another formulation of the same Marxist proposition, namely, "that thought is merely a function of the brain. This wording suffers from considerable vagueness; therefore, I shall not go into it." Masaryk felt that this kind of materialism was both vulgar and obsolete.

Masaryk also objected to the proposition that spirit is the highest product of matter. Referring to Engels' *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, he first summarised the propositions contained therein to the effect that matter is not the product of spirit, but that, on the contrary, spirit is the product of matter; that the material world perceived by the senses and to which we ourselves belong is primary and objectively real; and that our thinking is the product of a material, corporeal organ—the brain. Then Masaryk completed his presentation with his own comment: "This was, in any event, pure materialism, and Feuerbach himself feared its consequences."²

Masaryk's crude revisionist distortion of dialectical materialism received just criticism in Plekhanov's article "About Masaryk's Book". Examining Masaryk's statement that "Feuerbach thought so critically that he could not swallow materialism whole, with all its consequences", Plekhanov wrote that "the professor [that is, Masaryk—M.S.] heard this from Engels, but Engels *knew* what these words meant when he wrote them, and Mr. Masaryk *did not know* what

¹ Ibid., pp. 81-82.

² Ibid., p. 77.

they meant when he copied them. Therefore, he confirms them with this kind of thinking: 'That is why we find him [Feuerbach—*G. P.*] making up such original excuses as when, in answer to the question, where does the soul come from, he answers that it comes from the same place the body comes from, that it develops along with the body, etc. . . .' What is so 'original' here? The same thing was said, for example, by *La Mettrie*, who of course accepted materialism '*with all its consequences*'. And why are these 'excuses'? Do any facts contradict what Feuerbach says about the relationship between 'spirit' and matter?"¹

Masaryk also took exception to the Marxist proposition that the actual unity of the world lies in its materiality, and that this unity is proved by the lengthy development of philosophy and natural science.²

While attacking materialism in general, and Marxist materialism in particular, Masaryk defended the religious-idealist understanding of the world. For example, in *The Social Question*, he attacked Marxism because "Marx and Engels have put *matter* in the place of *God* [emphasis added—*M. S.*] and have placed themselves at the mercy of blind chance. . . ." "In a blind and insignificant world," he continued, "there is no place nor time for happiness and love. When Christ died, the evangelist tells us, there was a darkness over all the earth and the sun was darkened. So does man's inner world grow dark when the deity dies within him or when man himself kills it in himself. Hegel killed God just as did Schopenhauer. Feuerbach, Strauss, Stirner and Marx completed Hegel's work. And darkness fell and the sun's light failed."³

Masaryk's religious preaching was sharply criticised by Plekhanov. For example, he wrote the following in regard to the statement quoted above: "There is no question about

¹ G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 679.

² See Masaryk, op. cit., p. 83.

³ Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 315-16.

it: Mr. Masaryk certainly writes well about God! Our Messrs. Struve and Berdyaev also write fairly well now and then about this 'substance', but they have a long way to go to match Masaryk: they don't have that loftiness and that sensitivity which distinguish the divine sermons of the professor from the Czech University. True, Messrs. Struve and Berdyaev have only recently begun to write about the 'sublime'. They still lack the proper skills; but in time they, too, will probably improve."¹

Masaryk devoted two pamphlets solely to his religious views: *The Struggle for Religion* (1904) and *Review of the Latest Philosophy of Religion* (1905).

Since he stood on religious-idealist positions in philosophy, Masaryk considered the absence of theology in Marxism, the fact that it was an anti-religious teaching, to be one of its shortcomings.

Thus, Masaryk stood on religious positions in the fundamental question of philosophy, putting *God* in the place of *matter*. As for his understanding of mental processes, he stood on the ground of subjective idealism. He felt that ideology and all the various forms of social consciousness had to be examined from the standpoint of individual psychology; his position, therefore, was that of psychological individualism.²

Marxist philosophical materialism and modern natural science confront idealism with the indisputable fact that there is no thinking outside the brain. Thinking is a function of the brain; it is its product and is inseparable from it. Thinking, Lenin pointed out, "is a function of that particularly complex fragment of matter called the human brain".³

It is not our purpose to give here a full account of how Marxist philosophical materialism resolves the fundamental

¹ G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 677.

² See Masaryk, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 258-60.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 228.

question of philosophy. Our aim is to reveal the scientific groundlessness of Masarykism and to show how Masaryk misinterpreted Marxism. We pointed out earlier that the strength and scientific validity of Marxist philosophy lies, in particular, in the fact that it has its foundations in the concrete natural and social sciences. This connection is in no way accidental, for *Marxist philosophy* and the *concrete sciences* are to an equal extent a scientific reflection of reality; they understand and view the world as it exists in reality, without introducing any idealist inventions into it. It was this scientific orientation of Marxist materialism and, consequently, its connection with the concrete natural sciences, that evoked such strong opposition to it from Masaryk.

Let us examine some of the natural science premises of the materialist solution of the fundamental question of philosophy. There is a body of experimentally verified scientific data which proves the scientific validity of the Marxist solution of the fundamental question of philosophy and demonstrates the groundlessness of Masarykism and its revision of philosophical materialism on this question.

Present-day science, and particularly the physiology of higher nervous activity, views mental processes as the highest function of the brain.¹

The scientific disclosure of the material nature of mental processes began with the works of the great Russian physiologist I. M. Sechenov. Prior to that, an unscientific understanding of the nature of mental processes had prevailed, taking the form either of a vulgar materialist understanding of the material nature of the psyche—as, for example, the materialism of Vogt, Moleschott and Büchner—or of an idealist understanding—as, for example, the physiological idealism of Helmholtz and Müller.

Beginning with the extensive experimental research of I. P. Pavlov and his school of physiology, the material na-

¹ See *Scientific Session on the Problems of Academician Pavlov's Teaching in Physiology*, Moscow, 1950, p. 62 (in Russian).

ture of the spiritual, of the mental, was established and the mechanism of nervous processes in the brain which underlie mental activity was revealed. This research fully confirmed the proposition in Marxist philosophy that thought and consciousness are the product of the brain and constitute its highest function. Pavlov and his school gave a strictly scientific explanation to such concepts as mind, volition, feeling, etc., on the basis of data gathered in a "strictly objective study of higher nervous activity. This is how he [Pavlov—M. S.] conceived the superimposing of the phenomena of psychic activity onto physiological facts, the 'fusion' of the psychological and the physiological, the establishment of relationships and coincidences among the things that previously had been described by subjective physiology. The highest function of the brain, which we call mental activity, was for Pavlov the unity of the subjective and the objective."¹

The data of modern biology and, in particular, the teaching of Pavlov and his followers in physiology, reveal in greater and greater depth the veracity of the propositions of Marxist philosophical materialism, which hold that mental processes, including thought itself, are a function of the brain which is inseparably linked with the higher nervous processes taking place in its cortex. Masaryk's idealist criticism of the materialist solution of the fundamental question of philosophy, therefore, receives no substantiation from science.

Equally groundless is Masarykism's objection to Engels' proposition, mentioned above, that thought and consciousness, as products of the human brain, as products of Nature, *do not contradict* the rest of *Nature* but are in *correspondence with it*.²

But, here again, Engels' proposition is fully substantiated by modern biology and particularly by the physiology of higher nervous activity. In 1930—many years after his pio-

¹ Ibid., p. 89.

² See Masaryk, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 81-82.

neering experimental work—Pavlov himself, in his “Answer of a Physiologist to Psychologists”, summed up the basic conclusions drawn from his work as follows: “Man is, of course, a system (more crudely, a machine), and like every other system in nature this system is governed by the inevitable *laws common to all nature*; but it is a system which, within the field of our scientific vision, is unique for its extreme power of self-regulation.... The chief, strongest and most permanent impression we get from the study of higher nervous activity by our method is the extraordinary plasticity of this activity, and its immense potentialities: nothing is immobile, intractable, everything may always be achieved, changed for the better, provided only that the proper conditions are created.

“A system (a machine) and man, with all his ideals, aspirations and achievements—at first glance, how terribly discordant a comparison it seems! But is this really so? Even from the generally accepted point of view, is not *man the pinnacle of nature*, the highest embodiment of the resources of infinite nature, the incarnation of her mighty and still unexplained laws? Is this not rather calculated to enhance man’s dignity, to afford him the deepest satisfaction? And everything vital is retained that is implied in the idea of free will, with its personal, social and civic responsibility.”¹

In arguing against the materialist understanding and solution of the fundamental question of philosophy and against recognising the spiritual as the highest product of matter, Masaryk even questioned whether the solution of such a question lay in the province of science in general and of biology in particular. “Can modern science, and especially biology, venture to offer a teaching alleging that spirit is the ‘highest’ product of matter, as Engels puts it? I think that there is no need for me to say that for a long time now no serious investigator has made such an asser-

¹ I. P. Pavlov, *Complete Works*, Vol. 3, 1949, p. 454. (in Russian).

tion. But Engels does not tolerate any doubt in his materialist dogmatism."¹

Plekhanov exposed the weakness of Masaryk's argument in the following way: "...We open the French translation of Huxley's book on Hume, and there, on page 108, we find this: '*At present, no one standing at the height of modern science and knowing the facts will doubt that the basis of psychology must be sought in the physiology of the nervous system. That which is called the activity of the soul is the aggregate of brain functions, and the material of our consciousness is the product of brain activity* [emphasis added—G.P.]'. Is this not the same thing that Friedrich Engels said...? Engels called *spirit* exactly what Huxley called *elements of our consciousness*. Or, perhaps, the famous English naturalist wasn't a *serious student of nature*?"²

This statement of Masaryk's that Plekhanov criticised was not accidental. On the contrary, Masaryk later developed his views to the point of declaring any biological and, consequently, physiological, explanation of mental activity to be vulgar materialism.

"This materialism, dating back to the 18th century," Masaryk wrote in another part of his book *The Social Question*, "is odious to Engels because it is too mechanical; but does it become more correct if the mechanical explanation of spiritual life is replaced by a chemical and biological one, as Engels wants? Will materialism be less vulgar if it is understood biologically?"³

First of all, it should be noted that Engels did not at all consider 18th century materialism vulgar, even though he did expose its mechanistic character. So, Masaryk was already distorting Engels' view on that point. But let us turn to the substance of Masaryk's assertions about a biological explanation of spiritual life.

To get an experimentally substantiated, scientific answer

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 81.

² G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 679.

³ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 81.

to the question involved, let us refer to biology itself. Present-day biology fully refutes Masaryk's assertions, while Engels' propositions remain correct and scientific to this day. It was above all up to *biology* to settle the question as to whether mental processes, including human thinking, are the highest product of matter, the function of our brain. And the problem has been solved scientifically by Pavlov and his students and followers. Speaking before a scientific session devoted to Pavlov's teaching in physiology, Academician Bykov said that "a decisive blow to reactionary idealist theories was struck by the great representative of the science of *biology*, physiologist I. P. Pavlov, who showed in practice the correctness of the new and higher stage in the development of our views on the organism [emphasis added—M.S.]".¹

It turns out that Masarykism is completely groundless in respect to this question as well.

As we have seen above, in his attempt to undermine Marxism, Masaryk bent every effort to counterpose its philosophical propositions to the various natural sciences, biology in particular. He tried to do the same thing when it came to the question of the origin of life, a question which is part of the fundamental question of philosophy. Since it was biology that Masaryk tried to counterpose to statements made by Engels on this question, here again we shall examine the natural science foundations on which the Marxist propositions stand, showing also just how scientifically unsound Masaryk's position was. For example, in *The Social Question*, Masaryk made the following statement: "They tell us that the original germs out of which man developed came, by means of chemical action, from *protoplasm* or *protein bodies*. Needless to say, modern biology is far from considering this such a simple matter [emphasis added—M.S.]".²

¹ *Scientific Session...*, p. 13.

² Masaryk, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

Once again, in an effort to oppose Engels' propositions to biology, Masaryk distorts Engels' view. Engels did not conceive the matter to be as simple as Masaryk would have us believe he did, and he did not say what Masaryk said. Engels was not speaking of the germ out of which man developed; he was speaking of living organisms and their specific differences from inanimate nature. This was particularly stressed by Engels in the following definition of life: "Life is the mode of existence of protein bodies, the essential element of which consists in *continual metabolic interchange with the natural environment outside them*, and which ceases with the cessation of this metabolism, bringing about the decomposition of the protein."¹ As we can see, Masaryk did a thorough job of distorting Engels' propositions.

In the first place, Engels spoke of life as a means of *metabolic interchange*, and in the second place, he spoke specifically of *protein metabolism*. Engels' propositions on this score are still scientifically valid today and have been given experimental confirmation in the works of outstanding biologists. Present-day natural science is in complete agreement with Engels' statement that the essential feature of life is *metabolism*. An organism lives only as long as it is able continually to assimilate substances and the energy connected with them. Along with assimilation, there is also the opposite process—dissimilation. The substance of a living organism never remains static; it is continually breaking down and building up again as a result of numerous and closely interlaced processes of decomposition and synthesis. In other words, there is a continual process of *metabolic interchange*.

Analysis of the *protoplasm* of living organisms shows that *proteins* play an important role in *metabolism*. They undergo chemical changes themselves and involve other protoplasmic substances in these changes. The results of

¹ F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, Moscow, 1966, p. 301.

many studies have shown that any *protoplasmic* substance can actually participate in *metabolism* only by interacting with a specific *protein* and forming a definite compound with it.¹

In concluding our examination of Masarykism and its revisionist criticism of Marxism on the fundamental question of philosophy, we can state the following: Masarykism is a variant of subjective idealism with a religious base; it calls for putting God in the place of matter. It also denies the material nature of mental phenomena, including human thought. The criticism of Marxism found in Masarykism is scientifically groundless, just as are Masaryk's basic religious-idealist premises. Masarykism's alliance with religion makes it not only incompatible with genuine scientific propositions, but reactionary in the social sense.

3. THE AGNOSTICISM OF MASARYKISM IN THE THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE

Masarykism is just as scientifically untenable when it comes to its criticism of the Marxist theory of knowledge.

For Engels, Masaryk stresses, the relation of thought and being had another side—what is the relationship between the world and our thoughts about it? Can our thinking understand the real world? Are we able to produce the correct picture of reality through our thoughts and notions?²

He goes on to note that, in Engels' opinion, such philosophers as Hume and Kant answered this question in the negative and that their various idealist and philosophical "inventions", in Engels' opinion, could be quite easily and conclusively refuted: "Experiment and industry irrefutably prove that our thinking has a quite accurate conception of nature. This proof lies in the fact that we can create natural

¹ See A. M. Oparin, *The Origin of Life*, Moscow, 1952, pp. 11-13 (in Russian).

² See Masaryk, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

processes ourselves and make them serve our own purposes, thus putting an end to Kant's 'thing in itself' and all similar inventions. At present, this 'thing in itself' is being produced by chemistry; thus, for example, alizarin is a 'thing in itself'. For this reason, in Engels' opinion, it is absolutely senseless for German neo-Kantians and English agnostics to be enthusiastic about ... the ideas of Hume and Kant."¹

Having presented Engels' propositions, Masaryk almost immediately pounces on them. His indignation is most of all in behalf of Kant and Hume, who had a decisive influence on his (Masaryk's) agnosticism. He even exclaims: "Chemistry ... is proof against Kant!"² He then proceeds to question the existence of any materialist theory of knowledge at all. Nowhere, he says, do Engels or Marx make a detailed analysis of the origin of knowledge and the process of thinking, although one would expect such an analysis, since they transformed Hegel's dialectics. But what, Masaryk asks, does this modification consist of and what, generally speaking, is the substance of the new dialectics? What, strictly speaking, is the materialist process of cognition? With Hegel, dialectics was the "life and soul of scientific research"; what is its Marxist substance? asks Masaryk, adding that philosophers since Kant have done no little cogitation on the essence of our thought synthesis, and Kant himself wracked his brain over an analysis of this synthesis in order to determine as precisely as possible what we receive from the object and what the cognising subject creates out of himself, and where the remarkable system and integrity of our knowledge spring from.³ All this, however, does not prevent Masaryk from lashing out against the Marxist theory of reflection, the cornerstone of the materialist theory of knowledge. He focuses his attention on individual words, and, not understanding the

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., p. 79.

³ Ibid., pp. 82-83.

substance of the matter, tries to discredit the concept of cognition as the "reflection" in our consciousness of the phenomena of reality.

"I suggest," he writes, "that if the reader carefully examines Marx's or Engels' explanation, he will immediately run into some veritable theoretico-cognitive monsters." He then gives examples by citing Engels' famous propositions to the effect that the influences of the external world upon man express themselves in his brain, are reflected therein as feelings, thoughts, impulses, volitions, and that everything that sets men acting must find its way through their brains—even eating and drinking, which begin as a consequence of the sensation of hunger or thirst transmitted through the brain, etc. After citing these perfectly true and clear propositions, Masaryk exclaims: "Is there any need to point out that this whole explanation and each expression in it are exceedingly loose? How is one to conceive, for example, that the motive for a feeling is the reflection or expression in the brain of the external world?"

"It is also impossible to imagine psychologically just what Engels' 'image' (*Abbild*) of things is.... And what exactly is the 'reflection' (*Reflex*) of the external world, about which Engels speaks in other places?"¹

Once again, however, Masaryk's criticism is scientifically groundless. His inability to understand all this is what really looks monstrous. For it is precisely in the form of *reflection*, in the form of *reflexes*, that all our mental processes take place. The higher psychical processes, as has been established by modern physiology, function according to the principles of conditioned reflex elaboration.

Psychical processes as reflexes of the brain were first substantiated by the great Russian physiologist I. M. Sechenov in his work *Reflexes of the Brain*. Major contributions to the discovery and experimental study of the reflex mechanism of the brain were made by Pavlov and other

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., pp. 79-80.

outstanding Soviet physiologists. Modern biology has determined that "one of the most important phenomena in the animal organism is the *reflex*. All processes in the normal course are accomplished with the help of the reflex."¹

Mental processes—the highest function of the brain—also take place according to the reflex principle. Pavlov called these reflexes *conditioned* reflexes, or temporary connections. The *conditioned* reflex, according to Pavlov, is the most elementary and basic phenomenon in the cortex of the cerebral hemispheres. Through the nerve cells of the cortex a temporary connection is established between the external world (the stimulus) and the work of the internal organs. Conditioned stimuli are signals, as it were, for the organism's activity, and they greatly extend the temporary connection of the internal organs with the environment.² The conditioned reflex is formed on the basis of the unconditioned reflex. Conditioned reflexes are also easily elaborated in human beings in response to verbal stimuli, the mechanism of such reflexes being essentially the same as the mechanism of conditioned reflexes to sound, light, odour, etc.

The conditioned reflex, or temporary nerve connection, as Pavlov pointed out, "is the most universal physiological phenomenon both in the animal world and in ourselves. It is at the same time a psychical phenomenon—what psychology calls association, be it the formation of combinations derived from all manner of actions and impressions, or combinations derived from letters, words and thoughts. What basis could there be for differentiating, for separating apart, what the physiologist calls a temporary connection and the psychologist an association?"³

¹ *Scientific Session*. . . , p. 16.

² See K. M. Bykov, *New Developments in Pavlov's Theory of Higher Nervous Activity*, Moscow, 1947, p. 7 (in Russian).

³ I. P. Pavlov, *Complete Works*, Vol. 3, p. 561.

On the basis of his experimental work, Pavlov advanced a cohesive theory of two signal systems, both functioning on the principle of conditioned reflexes. He differentiated between the direct impressions from the various agents in the environment, on the one hand, and words, pronounced, heard or seen (that is, written), on the other. His theory of the first and second signal systems of the brain is built on this basis.¹

It should be stressed that it is through the second signal system—the vehicle of verbal thought and of speech—that “inter-human signalisation”, as Pavlov put it, the “grandiose signalling function of speech”, takes place. Therefore, the socially determined nature of the historical evolution of the second signal system, its development in the life of each individual, is unquestionable. But the first signal system in man also develops in social conditions and in conditions of constant interaction with the second signal system.²

“If our sensations and notions relating to the surrounding world,” Pavlov wrote, “are for us the primary signals of reality, the concrete signals, then speech, chiefly the kinesthetic stimulations flowing into the cortex from the speech organs, are the secondary signals, the signals of signals. They represent in themselves abstractions of reality and permit of generalisations, which indeed makes up our added *special human mentality*. . . .”³

Thus, we find that in this difficult problem of natural science it has now been proven by experimental means that for man the word is just as real a conditioned stimulus as are all the other stimuli he and the lower animals are exposed to in common.

Through his experimental research, Pavlov gave scientific substantiation to the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge,

¹ See *Scientific Session*. . . , pp. 100-01.

² Ibid.

³ I. P. Pavlov, *Complete Works*, Vol. 3, p. 490.

which recognises the existence of the objective world outside us and independent of our consciousness, a world that is *reflected* in the sensations and in the consciousness of man. And he revealed the mechanism by which the "subjective image of the objective world" is formed through complex reflex activity.

To be sure, Masaryk wrote *The Social Question* before Pavlov completed his study of higher nervous activity. But Pavlov's work only gave experimental proof to what Engels had already said earlier. Besides this, even at the time Masaryk was writing his anti-Marxist book, some eminent scientists were publishing works in which they substantiated the *reflectory* nature of mental activity. In particular, Sechenov's *Reflexes of the Brain* came out at that time. It was only Masaryk's overall orientation—expressed, in part, in his denial of any necessary connection between philosophy and the natural sciences—that led him to embrace anti-scientific, revisionist views of the theory of reflection. This anti-scientific tendency in Masarykism, as mentioned earlier, was conditioned above all on the social and class considerations of Masaryk himself. The propositions of modern biology presented above clearly reveal the total worthlessness of Masaryk's clamorous assertions against the Marxist theory of knowledge.

In dealing with the question of social relations, Masaryk also argued from the positions of positivism and agnosticism, of Kant's understanding of experience, of reducing scientific cognition to the registration of facts, and, consequently, of denying the possibility of cognising the essence of social phenomena.

We have seen above that the theory of reflection is a truly scientific theory of knowledge, backed by data flowing from various natural sciences. We have seen the untenable position from which Masaryk tried to distort this theory. As far as Masaryk was concerned, such scientific concepts as reflection (*Reflex*) and image (*Abbild*) were just so many stylistically unfortunate expressions; he did not grasp the

fundamental scientific meaning of these concepts, concepts which accurately reflect what is taking place in reality.

Let us now turn to another aspect of the matter, namely, whether cognition based on the reflection of reality—either in the form of images or in the form of concepts (generalisations)—is just as dialectical as reality itself. Masaryk, being an idealist and metaphysician, denied the dialectics of concepts, trying thereby to distort Marx's and Engels' theory of knowledge. In *The Social Question*, for example, he wrote: "According to the theory of knowledge of Marx and Engels, a concept is simply the reflection of things in the brain. Just what this reflection is and how, generally speaking, it is possible, we shall not go into at this point, but it is obvious that from such a point of view Hegel's dialectics of concepts is impossible."¹

This and other statements made by Masaryk to deny the dialectical nature of cognition were criticised by Plekhanov, who pointed out that the dialectics of concepts is fully consonant with the Marxist view of cognition as reflection of reality. "The whole question," Plekhanov wrote, "obviously depends on *how things happen in nature*: if everything happens in it—as Engels says—*dialectically*, then it is clear on the face of it that *concepts, which are the 'reflection of things in the brain'*, must be of a dialectical nature. Strange that Masaryk didn't come up with such a simple, and one may say, *unavoidable* conclusion. Evidently he was just absent-minded."²

Plekhanov also justly criticised the following statement of Masaryk's: "In any event, Marx and Engels looked for a substantiation of dialectics only in nature.... But from nature dialectics gets into the brain (the brain is, after all, also nature!), and in the end materialism has the same method as idealism."³

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 66.

² G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 670.

³ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 67.

"What our critic is now saying," Plekhanov wrote apropos the above statement, "shows how thoughtlessly and prematurely he began to assert that the dialectics of concepts is impossible: after all, if the processes of nature are dialectical processes, and if 'from nature dialectics gets into the brain' (amazing style!), then it is clear that the dialectics of concepts is *both possible and necessary*."¹

Masaryk further concluded that Engels was obliged to secretly acknowledge subjective dialectics as well. This fallacious conclusion, based on false premises, was also aptly criticised by Plekhanov: "We think that Engels acknowledged subjective dialectics not only *unter der Hand* but quite directly and openly. This can amaze only those who understand nothing in Engels' world outlook. Evidently Mr. Masaryk is among them. If he ascribes to Engels only secret . . . acknowledgement of subjective dialectics, it is because he himself finds *any* acknowledgement of it *amazing*. Yet what can be simpler and more natural? If our concepts are a 'reflection' of processes in nature, then they *cannot be deprived of the dialectical element*. Whoever acknowledges the existence of dialectical processes in nature *must acknowledge 'subjective dialectics'*. Who can find this amazing?"²

Being an agnostic in respect to the theory of knowledge, a metaphysician in respect to the method of cognition and an idealist in his interpretation of cognisable phenomena, Masaryk completely twisted and misunderstood Marxist teaching on objective, relative and absolute truth, on the stages of cognition—sensation, perception, representation and logical thinking—on practice as the criterion of truth, etc. At this point we should look into some of these questions. Let us examine, first, Masaryk's ideas about the method of cognition.

Masaryk wrote: "In contrast to modern positive science,

¹ G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 672.

² Ibid., p. 673.

that is, essentially to natural science, the *old* philosophy and *metaphysics* used an *ideological* or *a priori* method; it did not try to learn the characteristics of an object *from the object itself*, but purposefully from *ideas* about the object. Marx and Engels consider this obsolete method to be an *ideological* method, or *ideology in general*. But *ideology* means 'dealing with ideas as independent essences, developing independently and governed by their own laws'.

"Engels does not deny that *this* was a legitimate method in the past. It was necessary, he says, to study *things* first, and only later did it become possible to study *processes* [emphasis added—M.S.]."¹

Not a single statement in the above excerpt is well grounded, and the only aim behind all of them is to distort the views of Marx and Engels and to defend idealism and metaphysics.

Firstly, Masaryk confuses "ideology" and "idealism"; moreover, he ascribes this confusion to Engels by defining "*ideology*" with words Engels used in referring to "*idealism*". Marx and Engels, however, made a fundamental distinction between the concepts "ideology" and "idealism".

Secondly, Masaryk connects "the old philosophy and metaphysics" with idealism only, or as he expressed it, with the "ideological method". Actually, however, it is not only the various kinds of idealism that are related to the "old philosophy", but also varieties of pre-Marxist materialism. It is also not true that metaphysics is reduced to idealism only; a good many trends in pre-Marxist materialism also used the metaphysical method.

Thirdly, we find that in the first paragraph quoted above, Masaryk speaks of idealism—of cognising *not the object itself*, but the *idea* about the object, while in the second paragraph he speaks of studying the objects *themselves*, of studying things before it was possible to study processes

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., pp. 88-89.

(and, here also, not *ideas* about processes, but the processes *themselves*). Therefore, references to Engels in the second paragraph have no relation whatever either to Engels or to idealism, which is the subject of the first paragraph. Masaryk tries to reinforce what he says about idealism in the first paragraph with the propositions he advances in the second paragraph, the latter having to do with the materialist, albeit metaphysical, method of study. Needless to say, this kind of switching of issues only testifies to the theoretical weaknesses of Masaryk himself. He produces all this revisionist distortion of Marx's and Engels' views, and all this absurd logic for the sole purpose of defending idealism and idealist metaphysics. The metaphysical method in the hands of idealism, as we shall see below, amounts to denying the possibility of knowing reality—that is, agnosticism.

"Marx and Engels," Masaryk writes, "recognise only the dynamic factor, therefore they separate it from the static factor, creating out of the two methodological categories, thereupon one historical category. However, there is no doubt that a dynamic, historical examination is impossible without studying things themselves as they are *without any relation to motion and development* [emphasis added—M.S.]."¹

What Masaryk is saying, in essence, is that the dialectical method recognises only motion without that which moves. This is, of course, absurd. Marxists view motion as a process that is inseparable from matter, phenomena. Motion for them is the mode of existence of matter, of things. Consequently, Masaryk's assertions do not in any way apply to Marxism and constitute nothing but Masaryk's own distorted revisionist idea of the dialectical process of cognising reality. But what was Masaryk himself after? He was advocating the study of "things as they are *without any relation to motion and development*". But this is out-and-out metaphysics in the theory of knowledge—an artificial

¹ Ibid., p. 89.

separation in time and space of things and phenomena, which move and develop, from their motion and development. At a certain stage in the development of human cognition, man did study the properties of things and phenomena in isolation from their function and state of development; but that stage, in the eyes of modern science, belongs to the distant past.

Let us see how Masaryk develops his "theory of knowledge" further. Rejecting *idealism*, he writes, Engels "gives us an equally unacceptable definition of materialism", "he tries in the following way to prove that it is impossible for cognition to have *philosophical* foundations: principles, he says, are not the starting point of research, but its end result; principles are not applied to Nature and human history, but are *derived* from them; it is not Nature and the realm of humanity which conform to these principles, but on the contrary, the principles are valid only insofar as they are in conformity with Nature and history...". Masaryk's reply to this is that "it is not true that in our cognition it is a matter of the historical development of a given experience, a matter of a special kind of *experience* that has been *put into order* and *organised into a system*. *Abstracting*, of which Marx and Engels continually speak with a certain amount of disdain, is *precisely such a principle which systematises experience*. But the criterion of truth, the criterion of certainty which philosophers have been seeking since the beginning of thought, is something other than the abstraction of general propositions and the investigation of whether they agree with experience [emphasis added—M.S.]."¹

With these propositions Masaryk again introduced confusion and distorted Marx's and Engels' theory of knowledge in order to defend his idealist viewpoint.

Firstly, in rejecting idealism Engels was showing the impossibility of *idealist philosophical* foundations of cogni-

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 84.

tion and not the impossibility of philosophical foundations of cognition in general. On the contrary, Engels argued that *materialist philosophical* foundations of cognition are necessary, and that is why he included a theory of knowledge in Marxist philosophy, one of whose founders he was himself. Here again, as we see, Masaryk distorted Engels' views. Engels stood firmly on *materialist philosophical* positions when he argued that principles must be the result of the scientific cognition of reality. In Masaryk's opinion, however, principles in the form of abstraction should be thought up by philosophers and introduced into reality. When Masaryk spoke of abstraction, he did not mean the generalisation of human knowledge about reality, otherwise he would not have objected to the kind of abstraction Engels had in mind when he spoke of principles being "derived" from reality and thus constituting the end result of scientific study and not its beginning.

Secondly, then, Masaryk distorted Marx's and Engels' views on *abstraction* by giving the word an *idealist* interpretation. As for Marx's and Engels' attitude towards abstraction, it is not at all true that they spoke of abstraction with disdain. On the contrary, Marx not only recognised abstraction, but considered it to be the basic method of political economy. In the first volume of *Capital* Marx even gave a special explanation, which, incidentally, Masaryk must have been aware of, since he had made a futile effort to "reveal the contradictions" between the first and third volumes of that work. "In the analysis of economic forms," Marx wrote in the preface to the first volume of *Capital*, "...neither microscopes nor chemical reagents are of use. The force of *abstraction* must replace both [emphasis added—M.S.]."¹ This shows, therefore, that Marx's basic work *Capital* is inseparable from scientific abstraction. Similarly, Engels often stressed the need to apply the method of abstraction, or the method of logic, in such a

¹ K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1965, p. 8.

science as political economy. Hence, to say that Marx and Engels held abstraction in disdain means to distort their views by ascribing to them an attitude they did not have.

The crux of the matter, then, is that Masaryk defended *abstract idealist* calculations and not *scientific abstraction* as a method of generalising and cognising the essence of phenomena.

Let us now turn to another proposition appearing in the excerpt from Masaryk's book quoted earlier. According to Marxist theory, practice is the criterion of the correctness of our knowledge. Masaryk also tried to show that the criterion of truth is the extent to which this or that general proposition agrees with *experience*. But what kind of experience? In Masaryk's opinion, "experience" must be *systematised by a principle* expressing a philosophical *idealist abstraction*. Hence it turns out that the criterion of truth is not practice but a philosophical *idealist abstraction*. Such is the Masarykist subjective-idealist conception of the relationship between reality and abstraction.

The propositions we have examined above clearly indicate that Masarykism is a variety of agnosticism according to which the source of our cognition does not lie in reality, but in idealist philosophy, in our thinking, in the abstractions of philosophers. Furthermore, as established earlier in our discussion, Masaryk did not regard the *reflection* of reality by our thinking as the *process of cognition*. Therefore, according to Masarykism, cognition of reality, in essence, turns out to be impossible.

Rejecting materialism in the theory of knowledge and in philosophy in general, Masarykism emerged as a reactionary revisionist ideology directed against the proposition that the real world is knowable. In contrast to it, "materialism," as Lenin wrote, "in general recognises objectively real being (matter) as independent of the consciousness, sensation, experience, etc., of humanity. Historical materialism recognises social being as independent of the social consciousness of humanity. In both cases conscious-

ness is only the reflection of being, at best an approximately true (adequate, perfectly exact) reflection of it. From this Marxist philosophy, which is cast from a single piece of steel, you cannot eliminate one basic premise, one essential part, without departing from objective truth, without falling a prey to bourgeois-reactionary falsehood."¹

4. THE ANTI-DIALECTICS AND METAPHYSICS OF MASARYKISM

As much of a characteristic feature of Masarykism as its struggle against materialism is its struggle against dialectics and its defence of idealist metaphysics. Here again we find that it is not the interests of science, but the selfish class considerations of Masaryk as an ideologist of the bourgeoisie that are basic. Since the main task of our book is to expose Masarykism as the *source* of various *revisionist* trends against Marxism, the chief emphasis will be given to revealing the untenability and class motivations of Masaryk's *revision* and criticism of dialectics. This does not mean, however, that we shall not look into the metaphysical and idealist positions of Masarykism itself. With this brief introduction let us turn now to Masaryk's views on dialectics.

In *The Social Question*, he wrote that "objective dialectics simply does not exist. Dialectical contradictions do not exist in things themselves. We may speak of attraction and repulsion in the natural science sense of the word, of love and hate and of war and peace in human society, but all this is neither Hegel's dialectics nor Marx's dialectics."² This unsubstantiated statement about the absence of dia-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 326.

² Masaryk, op. cit., p. 69. Masaryk's denial that dialectics exists in nature was criticised by Plekhanov, who wrote: "'Objective dialectics simply does not exist.' We have heard this, but we ask you, Herr Professor, to prove it to us. 'Dialectical contradiction does not exist in nature.' Again, this is not *proof*, but a *repetition* of that which we

lectics is already refuted by Masaryk's enumeration of *contradictory* phenomena. Besides this, Masaryk thought that attraction and repulsion in the *natural science* sense of the word is not concrete scientific confirmation that dialectics exists in nature and that this is why there exists a *natural science* reflection in the categories "repulsion" and "attraction". We can already see that Masarykism opposes *science* in that it rejects something that the natural sciences recognise as being in conformity with laws. Obviously not understanding dialectics at all, Masaryk called Hegel's dialectics "simple hocus-pocus" and a "*metaphysical cob-web*".¹

This untenable hanging of labels on dialectics only shows how incapable Masaryk was of examining the substance of its propositions, to say nothing of the fact that calling *dialectics* a *metaphysical cob-web* shows complete scientific illiteracy; it can only cause one to doubt whether Masaryk knew *what dialectics is* and *what metaphysics is*.

But let us see what Masarykism has to say. Trying to undermine the scientific significance of materialist dialectics, Masaryk resorted to distortion only to get tangled up in his own contradictory arguments. He wrote, for example, that at first Marx was a Hegelian, but then went over to Feuerbach's point of view. From Hegel he borrowed the dialectical method and from Feuerbach—materialism. But dialectics and materialism are incompatible: "Materialist dialectics is a *contradictio in adjecto*."²

"Marx and Engels did not understand," Masaryk continued, "that dialectics was inappropriate for them. This is a very important circumstance; we find a great many contradictions in the details of their system, and this is explained by the contradiction in the theoretical foundation

have been asking Mr. Critic to *prove*.... The rest of the phrase we have cited is also *not proof, but a restatement of that which requires proving*" (G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 674).

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 63.

² Ibid., p. 66.

of the entire system.”¹ These empty assertions imputing that Marx and Engels had subscribed to idealist dialectics have already been exposed by Plekhanov, who pointed out that Masaryk had proved nothing at all about materialist dialectics, but only got himself in a tangle. The following admission made by Masaryk is one evidence of this: “It is true that Marx and Engels revolt against Hegel and condemn his method.” If that is so, Plekhanov wrote, “the question is, what about that ‘very important circumstance’ of their not understanding that Hegel’s dialectics was inappropriate for them?”²

Already in a tangle and having missed the distinction between *idealist* and *materialist* dialectics, Masaryk went on to contradict himself conclusively. He wrote: “Generally Marx . . . *quite consistently rejects* Hegel’s dialectics. Engels and Marx also praise Feuerbach for having overcome Hegel’s dialectics, and then, suddenly, *they accept this* dialectics in its entirety [emphasis added—M.S.]”³ Such statements only prove that Masarykism is groundless and that it distorts Marxist views. In the first volume of *Capital*, which Masaryk so often quoted in *The Social Question*, Marx said the following: “My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. . . . The mystifying side of Hegelian dialectic I criticised nearly thirty years ago, at a time when it was still the fashion.”⁴

Thus, neither earlier nor later did Marx embrace Hegel’s dialectics, and Masaryk’s assertions on this score are a gross distortion of Marxism and deliberate concealment of what Marx said about his materialist dialectics.

Regarding the fact that Marx and Engels praised Feuerbach for having “overcome” Hegel’s dialectics, it should be remembered that they were referring to idealist dialectics, towards which they held a negative attitude

¹ Ibid., p. 68.

² G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 674.

³ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 67.

⁴ K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 19.

ever since. But when they defended and advocated the dialectical method, they were talking about materialist dialectics, which had rendered them such great service in putting socialism on a scientific basis. There is absolutely no contradiction in this.

"At first, Masaryk undertook to prove to us that *materialist* dialectics is a *contradictio in adjecto*," Plekhanov pointed out. "But now he fails to distinguish between this dialectics and *idealist* dialectics and states that Marx and Engels, having first rejected the latter, 'suddenly' accepted it in its entirety. One would have to be quite mixed up in one's arguments to make such unexpected. . . logical jumps."¹

Now that it is perfectly clear that Masaryk had absolutely no *scientific* grounds for his *revisionist* views on materialist dialectics, let us ascertain just what reasons Masaryk did have for his anti-scientific and irresponsible distortions of dialectics. As we shall see below, the real reason behind these distortions lies in the political and social ideas of Masaryk as an ideologist of the bourgeoisie in the period of imperialism. The whole point is that dialectics views *social revolutions* as the *natural result* of the development of a society based on class antagonism. Distorting Hegel's views and again confusing Hegel's dialectics and materialist dialectics, Masaryk wrote: "Hegel already had an idea of development and progress, but that idea does not correspond to present-day views. . . . He conceived of progress through catastrophes, through large upheavals and contradictions. In this he was followed by Feuerbach, and following them both was Marx."²

Again, Masaryk was saying something that wasn't so. Hegel never said that development took place only "through catastrophes, large upheavals and contradictions". Hegel felt that development also consists of infinitely small changes and contradictions. At the same time, he pointed out that these infinitely small changes and contradictions not only do not exclude "large upheavals and contradictions" but

¹ G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., pp. 671-72.

² Masaryk, op. cit., pp. 69-70.

sometimes inevitably lead to them. Hegel called in question the famous metaphysical proposition to which Masaryk so zealously subscribed¹: "nature makes no leaps". If Masaryk finds, Plekhanov wrote in his article, "that Hegel's arguments are groundless, then let him refute them. But he doesn't even try to do this. *He confines himself to distorting Hegel's idea.* There's a 'critic' for you!"²

This distortion is in itself characteristic; it reveals the *social* side of all the attacks against Hegelian dialectics. This dialectics, said Plekhanov, is odious to philistines because it justifies "*large upheavals*". *Das ist des Pudels Kern*.³ Of course, the bourgeoisie and its ideologists are much more disturbed from a class standpoint by *materialist* dialectics, and Masaryk's distortions of materialist dialectics and of Marx's philosophy as a whole are explained by the fact that this dialectics and this philosophy, as Plekhanov correctly noted, are a veritable *algebra of revolution*.⁴

This, then, is why dialectical philosophy was so annoying to Masaryk. "For it [dialectical philosophy] nothing is final, absolute, sacred. It reveals the transitory character of everything and in everything; nothing can endure before it except the uninterrupted process of becoming and of passing away, of endless ascendancy from the lower to the higher. And dialectical philosophy itself is nothing more than the mere reflection of this process in the thinking brain. It has, of course, also a conservative side: it recognises that definite stages of knowledge and society are justified for their time and circumstances; but only so far. The conservatism of this mode of outlook is relative; its *revolutionary* character is absolute—the only absolute dialectical philosophy admits [emphasis added—M. S.]."⁵

¹ See Masaryk, *The Beginning of a Socialist Society*, Russ. ed., St. Petersburg, 1906, p. 20.

² G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 675.

³ Ibid., pp. 675-76.

⁴ Ibid., p. 676..

⁵ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, pp. 339-40.

CHAPTER 3

CRITIQUE OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIO-POLITICAL CONCEPTS OF MASARYKISM

1. SOCIETY AND THE HUMAN ESSENCE FROM THE STANDPOINT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL INDIVIDUALISM

As in questions of general philosophy, Masaryk was also an idealist and metaphysician in questions of sociology. He rejected the proposition that human consciousness is determined by material social being.¹ He maintained that man's spiritual life is independent of the economic conditions of society, and he pointed to the behaviour of Hus, the strong faith of Luther and the scientific works of Newton, etc., as examples allegedly confirming his position. We shall discuss these examples later²; but at this point, let us examine the positions from which Masarykist sociology proceeds.

The initial positions of Masarykism in sociology are characterised by a religious-idealist understanding of the development of society, by a combination of this understanding with a subjective-idealist interpretation of society, inasmuch as Masaryk viewed society from the standpoint of extreme *individualism*.

In *The Social Question*, he wrote: "One thing is certain: the masses *resp.* classes do not constitute the ultimate motive force of history. The masses—be they organised politically, economically, intellectually, religiously or as a nation—are always a large and, in practice, often decisive force; but *individuals*, existing alongside them and within them in *all*

¹ See Masaryk, op. cit., pp. 126-28.

² See sections on the class struggle and on the national question.

spheres of life, are also a *decisive force*; and standing above them as a *decisive force* is criticism and the recognition of *other individuals*, contemporaries or descendants.... We must envisage the relation between *individualism* and collectivism much more precisely and more critically than did Marx and Engels.... And history as a science is not only the history of mass movements and the class struggle; it is also the *history* of many *individuals* [emphasis added—M.S.J.]”¹

Holding to subjective-idealist positions, Masaryk developed his individualism in the understanding of society as *psychological individualism*; he saw sociological questions in terms of psychological experiences. “The social question,” he wrote, “at the present time—is the anxiety and dissatisfaction, the desire and trepidation, the hope and despair, the suffering and the bitterness of thousands and millions of people.”²

The anti-scientific nature of the initial positions of Masaryk’s psychological individualism becomes apparent from the outset. Masaryk reduces the social question to the psychological feelings of people, although it is obvious that the social question is a question of *social* organisation, of the structure of society and not at all a question of the psychological feelings of people. Psychological feelings are a problem of psychology, not of sociology. As we turn to what Masaryk wrote following his definition of the social question, we find even greater confusion and absurdity: “Concretely and practically, the social question at present is the question of socialism....”³ But everyone knows that socialism is a *social system* and not the aggregate of the psychological feelings of people. Here again we see that Masaryk intended to make a crude switch—to substitute a *psychological* question for the *social* question. Although this substitution makes no sense from the standpoint of *science* and *logic* and sounds

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 258.

² Ibid., p. 3.

³ Ibid.

like an absurdity, it does, nonetheless, make sense from the point of view of Masaryk's *social* and *class*, position as an ideologist of the bourgeoisie: a straightforward statement of the social question, without the substitution of any other question for it, would have meant raising the question of the elimination of capitalism and its replacement by socialism. By turning the social question into a psychological one, Masaryk could avoid the problem of capitalism and concern himself solely with people's feelings. Furthermore, by building his psychological conception on a foundation of *individualism*, Masaryk completely obscured any question of *social* reconstruction, even along psychological lines.

This means that Masaryk's initial subjective-idealist and psychological-individualistic positions represented a sharply defined bourgeois class point of view. This means that here, just as in questions of general philosophy, Masaryk did not take an "impartial" or "supra-class" approach, but was ruled by narrow class and social considerations. Consequently, his revisionist statements on various questions of historical materialism were of a class character—a bourgeois character.

So much for the initial positions from which Masaryk conducted his revisionist discourse on historical materialism. Let us now examine some of his views on the subject proper.

Masaryk maintained that any sociological foundation must always have a corresponding psychological underpinning,¹ and that one of the greatest shortcomings of historical materialism was its lack of such a psychological basis. He then went into a long revisionist dissertation, extremely typical of psychological individualism, but completely distorting historical materialism and revealing Masaryk's ignorance of the subject.

"Mass psychology," Masaryk wrote, "as understood by Marx and Engels means *illusionism*—the non-recognition of *individual* consciousness.

¹ See Masaryk, op. cit., p. 243.

"Marx's and Engels' communism has not only economic meaning, but *psychological* and *spiritual* meaning as well. The founders of Marxism considered *individual* consciousness *illusory, deceptive*, and therefore recognise only the collective, *mass*, general consciousness. Usually no one pays attention to this aspect of Marx's communism when analysing it, but it is no less important and *even more important* than the economic side. Marx's historical materialism and socialism became particularly significant precisely because of this spiritual communism.... Marx's socialism is spiritual and economic communism, or socialism in the strict sense of the world. It means that the 'lonely *individual*' has *no* meaning *whatever*, but *society* in its historical development means *everything*. Marx's socialism is a consistent *contrast of individualism* in all spheres. His extreme socialism means precisely that society is not only an economic whole, but a psychological one as well; in Marx's opinion, *society* and history, *not the individual*, are the subject of truth and law [emphasis added—M. S.]."¹

Everything that Masaryk said in the above quotation was a product of his own invention. Even if we disregard the clumsiness of his wording and get right to the essence of what he was trying to say, it turns out that to *counterpose the individual to a class, the masses and society*, as Masaryk did, is not in accordance with the viewpoint of historical materialism, but in accordance with the viewpoint of Masaryk's own *psychological individualism*.

Firstly, historical materialism considers it impossible to contrast the individual with society because the *individual* is the *carrier* of the aggregate of the *social* relations of the society in which he lives. In his *Theses on Feuerbach*, Marx emphasised that the *human essence* in its reality is the ensemble of the *social* relations.² Thus, the question of counterposing the individual to the masses, a class or society

¹ Ibid., pp. 244-45.

² See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 14.

is not a question raised by Marx's historical materialism but by psychological individualism.

Secondly, on the basis that the human essence, the individual, is *socially* determined, historical materialism holds that individual *consciousness* (in principle) also expresses social consciousness (in a class society—class consciousness or the consciousness of a specific social group) and that it develops in the direction of, not in opposition to, the development of the social consciousness. Hence, Marxism sees in such individual consciousness not some kind of individual essence, but social essence and meaning (in a class society—class essence and meaning).

Nor is the question of the illusory nature of individual consciousness raised by historical materialism. On the contrary, behind each individual philosophical and sociological system, historical materialism always sees its class, social essence and meaning. And it views the whole struggle in philosophy—despite the fact that individual philosophers are involved—as a struggle between classes and their world outlooks.

Thirdly, because Marxism sees in the individual his social essence, it does not deny, but on the contrary, it presupposes a definite role of the *individual* in *social* life.

Thus, Masaryk's concoctions about contrasting the individual with the masses, a class or society, etc.; about contrasting the history of the individual with the history of society, outside of which there is no history of the individual; about contrasting individualism with collectivism; about the illusory nature of individual consciousness divorced from the social environment which it reflects; and finally, about the denial of the significance of the individual as such—all are Masaryk's own fabrications and have no relation to historical materialism.

Fourthly and finally, historical materialism also provides an explanation for such ideological, philosophical conceptions as psychological individualism, which it views as the reflection of the life of a society based on *private* property.

Private property in economic life is precisely what engenders any number of individualistic conceptions. In this respect, Masarykism, a defender of private property, embraces the hackneyed private property conception of psychological individualism. Masaryk did not see or understand that private property, including capitalist private property, is an *historically transient* form of property. Nor did he understand that the roots of philosophical individualism lie in the material, economic conditions in which the dominant class of a society based on private property lives. Consequently, he could not understand that for a philosophy and sociology which stands for the elimination of private property and for the establishment of public property, the very conception of individualism disappears. The question of the relations between the individual and society is simply and scientifically solved by understanding the *human essence* as the *aggregate of social relations*. The illusion that the human essence consists of individualism is engendered only by the dominance of economic and social relations based on *private property*.

These considerations make crystal clear the class essence of Masarykism as an ideology of the bourgeoisie, the economic basis of whose social system is private property.

Another characteristic feature of Masarykism found in the propositions we have quoted and examined above is its ascribing a *psychological* nature to *social* questions. Masaryk even said that what he called *psychological, spiritual* side of Marx's historical materialism and socialism is *more important* than the economic side of Marxism. But here again, Masaryk presented only *his own deliberately distorted interpretation* of Marx's historical materialism and socialism, and tried to pass it off as the *real thing*. This *revisionist* distortion is directly connected with Masaryk's *class* aims and purposes, namely, to turn the *social* questions of transforming society, beginning with the transformation of its *economic* foundations, into questions of individual psycho-

logical feelings and other factors in the spiritual life of the individual.

Developing his individualistic conceptions further, Masaryk asserted that the relation of the individual to the masses should be defined not materialistically or economically, but ethically. This conclusion coincides with Bernstein's revisionism. It also fits right in with the views of the Russian Narodnik Mikhailovsky. Masaryk's, Bernstein's and Mikhailovsky's ideas about society and socio-economic formations were so much alike that here we may justifiably apply to Masaryk the criticism Lenin directed against Mikhailovsky in his work *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*. Incidentally, we also know that Masaryk made use of Mikhailovsky's work in his arguments against Marx's propositions on the development of socio-economic formations as a natural historical process.

"As you see," Lenin wrote in the above-mentioned work, "what interests this sociologist is only a society that satisfies human nature, and not at all some strange formations of society, which, moreover, may be based on a phenomenon so out of harmony with 'human nature' as the enslavement of the majority by the minority. You also see that from the standpoint of this sociologist there can be no question of regarding the development of society as a process of natural history."¹ But the very idea of materialism in sociology was a stroke of genius, for, as Lenin put it, it "created the possibility of a strictly scientific approach to historical and social problems".²

Attempting to *substitute psychology for sociology*, Masaryk looked for some kind of foothold for his psychological approach. He maintained, in this connection, that psychological analysis was of decisive significance in the ideological and spiritual life of people and that spiritual life was

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 137.

² *Ibid.*, p. 139.

independent of the economic conditions of society. In his opinion, for example, psychological analysis shows that religious sentiments and ideas, art, philosophy, morality, etc., have a value completely independent of economic relations and that history corroborates just such a psychological and philosophical assessment of religion.

Masaryk insisted that psychological explanations in the sphere of sociology and philosophy be accepted as reliable data. He reduced all sociological categories to the three psychological categories of feeling, reason and volition.

This point of view was also held by the Russian Machist Bogdanov, who felt that "*social life in all its manifestations is a consciously psychical life.... Social being and social consciousness are, in the exact meaning of these terms, identical.*"¹ And in Masaryk's opinion, "the situation in reality" is "that for man, being and consciousness are identical".²

On the whole, the fundamental ideas of Masarykism amount to eclecticism and not some kind of independent sociological trend. He borrowed much from A. Comte.

In summarising our examination of Masaryk's conceptions of psychological individualism in sociology it can be said that underneath the façade of psychological and philosophical verbiage there is no *scientific* substance to Masarykism. Behind its ideas of psychological individualism lie the *narrow class and social* considerations of Masaryk as an ideologist of the Czech bourgeoisie. These considerations pursue primarily the following aims:

1) to disunite working people in their struggle for their interests by preaching bourgeois individualism;

2) by reducing sociology to psychology, and social questions to psychological questions, to attempt to circumvent the question of the *social reorganisation* of society, including the

¹ Ibid., Vol. 14, p. 322.

² Masaryk, op. cit., p. 127.

revolutionary replacement of capitalism by socialism, and to focus attention on the psychological and moral improvement of the individual;

3) to distort Marx's historical materialism and socialism in such a way as to create doubt in their scientific value and genuine humanism. As we have seen, however, all that Masaryk did was to criticise his own revisionist and distorted conception of historical materialism.

Let us now examine some specific issues.

2. REJECTION OF THE IDEA THAT THE MATERIAL CONDITIONS OF SOCIETY ARE THE BASIS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

We should note first of all that Masaryk showed a total lack of understanding of the structure and inner logic of the Marxist-Leninist teaching.

In *The Social Question*, he stated that "the theory of so-called historical materialism flows naturally from Marx's economic theory". In this statement he immediately reveals his own ignorance of what Marxism is. Historical materialism flows from Marx's dialectical materialism and not from his economic theory. Marx's economic theory, however, is the application of historical materialism to the analysis of economic development; it is the economic substantiation of historical materialism. Obviously, Masaryk was unable to grasp the relationships and connections among the component parts of Marxism.

But to return to Masaryk's views on historical materialism itself. The first evidence of confusion and distortion we run into is Masaryk's attempt to reduce historical materialism to so-called economic materialism.¹ The fact is, however, that historical materialism does not regard only economic relations as the material conditions of social life, but also

¹ See Masaryk, op. cit., p. 124 *et seq.*

(a) the forces of production, which in conjunction with the economic relations constitute the mode of production; (b) population; and (c) the geographic environment. But instead of examining all these components of the material conditions as they are understood in historical materialism, Masaryk arbitrarily designated them as driving forces of the development of society.

Replacing the question of *defining* the concept of historical materialism with the question of its *various categories*, Masaryk stated that historical materialism's recognition of the class struggle as the *driving force* of social development was inconsistent.

Obviously, Masaryk's confusion of the question of historical materialism as the science which studies the general laws of social development with the question of but one of these laws (class struggle as the driving force of social development), only points to the groundlessness of Masaryk's revisionist criticism of historical materialism and has no relation to historical materialism itself.

Once Masaryk substituted the question of driving forces for the question of the material conditions of life and social development he began to ascribe to Marx and Engels things they had never written. He said, for example, that according to historical materialism there exist "*two* historical driving forces: the *inclination* towards rebellion and the inclination towards and the *desire* for power. How are these *two* obviously ultimate forces distributed between the two big classes, and how is the class struggle explained in terms of these forces [emphasis added—M. S.]?"¹ In this passage Masaryk grossly distorted the propositions of historical materialism on the class struggle and contradicted his own statements regarding driving forces of historical development.

Firstly, historical materialism does not regard the *inclination* of one class towards rebellion and that of another towards power as driving forces. This is an idealist

¹ Ibid., p. 240.

point of view that will not be found in historical materialism.

Secondly, historical materialism regards the *struggle* between classes, and not the classes *themselves*, as a driving force; what Masaryk divided into two forces does not, from the viewpoint of historical materialism, yet constitute the driving force of development. Only the struggle between these classes, as the struggle of opposites, constitutes the driving force. Therefore, the question of how "these two forces are distributed" is a question applied not to historical materialism, but to *distortion*, to Masarykism's revisionist conception of historical materialism.

Thirdly, Masaryk himself knew full well that historical materialism recognises class struggle as one driving force and does not regard each class in itself as being one of two driving forces. On page 239, from which we quoted above, and on pages 234-38 of his book *The Social Question*, he stated that according to historical materialism it is precisely the class struggle that is the driving force. Hence, in the passage quoted above, Masaryk contradicted his own statements.

After getting himself caught up in his own contradictions once, Masaryk proceeded to get tangled up completely. In addition to the two driving forces mentioned above he added others, allegedly in accordance with the views of Marx and Engels, such as motion, the law of negation, races, the geographical environment, population growth, etc., putting everything into one big pile. He wrote: "Here are the kinds of historical driving forces recognised by Marx and Engels..."¹

1) Motion: "historical motion produces social relations; individual motion produces the products of industry."

2) The law of negation: motion and development take place by means of contradictions.

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 240. For Masaryk's propositions on driving forces as enumerated, see pp. 240-41 of his book.

3) Races, except classes, and other social communities of the masses (peoples, groups of peoples).

4) Population and its growth as an economic and generally a social force.

5) Various forces of nature, as, for example, the earth, that is, the soil and the natural environment.

6) "Further, these driving forces, and very powerful ones, are the state and the remaining ideological factors, that is, morality *resp.* immorality, religion, art, science and philosophy. Engels quite definitely recognises the independence of these factors particularly in his later writings, but even in his earlier works there are places where this independence is acknowledged."¹

This entire enumeration of driving forces has, of course, no relation either to the Marxist theory of the material conditions of the life of society or to the theory of the driving forces of an antagonistic class society. It is merely a collection of Masaryk's senseless assertions and not Marx's and Engels' historical materialism. Heaped together are the material conditions of life—the geographical environment and population growth; historical motion; various social categories—peoples, groups of peoples; and various ideological social phenomena—the state, morality, art, science and philosophy.

And finally, with his assertion that there is a multiplicity of driving forces, Masaryk refuted statements he himself had made earlier, first about the class struggle *alone* being the driving force, and then about the *two* classes constituting two driving forces.

To sum up, Masaryk's revisionist criticism of historical materialism is completely groundless because he failed to bring out the *materialism* in historical materialism; he failed to examine the Marxist teaching on the geographical environment, population growth and the mode of production as the material conditions of the life of society, sub-

¹ Ibid., p. 241.

stituting in its stead the question of driving forces. The only thing that this *substitution* of questions proves is Masaryk's ignorance of historical materialism, the weakness of his revisionist criticism and the absurdity of his illogical and contradictory statements.

Another example of confusion in Masaryk's thinking is found in his remarks on Marx's and Engels' views on population as one of the material conditions of the life of society. According to historical materialism, he said, "*population* and its growth constitute an economic and generally a social force. Engels, as mentioned earlier, puts *population growth* alongside *relations of production*. And with Marx, *overpopulation* is also a powerful social and historical driving force [emphasis added—M.S.]."¹

Here again we have a complete confusion of categories.

In the first place, Marx never considered the *relative surplus population* under capitalism to be a powerful social and historical force.

In the second place, *population*, as one of the material conditions of the existence of any society, and the *relative surplus population* found under capitalism, as a calamity for the working people, are entirely and fundamentally different phenomena. Masaryk, however, in order to criticise historical materialism on the question of population as a necessary precondition for the existence of society substituted one question for the other indiscriminately. Specifically, for the question of *population* he substituted the question of the *relative surplus population* and the *reserve army of unemployed* in capitalist society. At one point he wrote that "Marx speaks harshly of Malthus. In Marx's opinion *overpopulation* is not absolute, but relative—*capitalism* creates for itself a reserve army of unemployed [emphasis added—M.S.]."² But then, denying the existence of a reserve army of unemployed under capitalist conditions, Masaryk proceeded with his

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 241.

² Ibid., p. 390.

switch of questions: "Engels recognises the natural growth of population as an historical driving force and includes this force in his theory of *historical materialism*; but Marx stubbornly tries to weaken the significance of *competition* (*supply* and *demand*), which according to Malthus and Darwin is a universal law.... *Overpopulation* is explained [by Marx—M.S.] not by eternal natural laws, but only by the 'natural historical laws' of *capitalist* production [emphasis added—M. S.]."¹

This statement in itself is a complete mishmash, resulting primarily from Masaryk's confusion of the concept of population growth, or population in general, as a necessary material conditions of the existence of any human society—which is what Engels was referring to—and the concept of the relative surplus population and the appearance of a reserve army of unemployed under capitalism—which is what Marx was referring to in his struggle against Malthusianism.

Masaryk engaged in even greater trickery when he attached a *zoological, physiological* meaning to the word "*natural*" in Marx's expression: "the historical natural law" of capitalist production. On the basis of this toying with the meaning of words, Masaryk concluded that with Marx and Engels "man is a purely zoological creature; with Marx, historical laws are the laws of nature".² For this reason, he, Masaryk, was "in essential agreement with Malthus. I consider overpopulation to be not only a physiological and zoological, but also an ethical question."³

And this is supposed to be "criticism"! The only thing it shows is that *Masarykism* is *Malthusianism*. Everything else is devoid of any theoretical or logical meaning and constitutes a gross misrepresentation of the views of Marx and Engels. Where did Masaryk get the idea that with Marx and Engels "man is a purely zoological creature"?

¹ Ibid., p. 391.

² Ibid., p. 392.

³ Ibid., p. 394.

To find a refutation of these revisionist statements we have only to refer to Marx's *Theses on Feuerbach*, appended to Engels' *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, that is, to the *Theses* which Masaryk quoted in his discussion of Marx's philosophical materialism. In these *Theses*, Marx wrote the following:

"Feuerbach resolves the religious essence into the *human* essence. But the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations.

"Feuerbach, who does not enter upon a criticism of this real essence, is consequently compelled:

"1. To abstract from the historical process and to fix the religious sentiment (*Gemüt*) as something by itself and to presuppose an abstract—*isolated*—human individual.

"2. The human essence, therefore, can with him be comprehended only as a 'genus', as an internal, dumb generality which merely *naturally* unites the many individuals."¹

In the next thesis, Marx again emphasised that "Feuerbach ... does not see that ... the abstract *individual* whom he analyses belongs in reality to a particular form of *society* [emphasis added—M.S.]"² In these propositions Marx attacked Feuerbach along two lines:

1) against *individualism* in the understanding of the human essence;

2) against *biologism* in understanding the connections between people.

In addition to this, Marx confirmed the *social* essence of man.

It is clear, therefore, that Masaryk's "zoological man" has no relation to Marxism, just as the *relative surplus population* as a *social* calamity under capitalism has no relation to *population* as one of the *material conditions* of the existence of any human society.

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 14.

² Ibid.

As for Masaryk's own views, we can see from the passage quoted earlier that he agreed with Malthus, with a theory that justifies the extermination of people and views wars as a social good which eliminates "superfluous" population. In Marxist and other progressive literature, Malthusianism is justifiably characterised as a misanthropic theory. Developments in the last half of the 19th century and especially in the 20th century have clearly shown that surplus population, about which Malthus wrote and which he felt it was expedient to regulate from time to time by means of wars, is in reality only the social disease of capitalism. All the various Malthusian and Masarykist arguments on this score have been refuted by the victory of the socialist revolution of 1917 in Russia and the establishment of a socialist system in the Soviet Union, as well as by the subsequent transition of a number of European and Asian countries, and Cuba in Latin America to the socialist path of development. In none of these countries is there either unemployment or that surplus population about which Malthus wrote in the 19th century. This is clear evidence that Marx was right in pointing out that the reserve army of unemployed and surplus population are of a relative and social character; they are not a natural law of the development of mankind, but social phenomena of capitalist society.

Moreover, most people today look upon the ideas of Malthusianism and neo-Malthusianism, which justify war as a means of eliminating "superfluous" population, as madness. Mankind, having reached the era of transition from capitalism to socialism in the social sphere, and the atomic age in the technological sphere, is now on its way towards ridding itself of world wars altogether. In this age, any armed attack (aggression) is looked upon as a crime against humanity. In the Charter of the Nuremberg International Tribunal, for example, the preparation, planning and waging of aggressive war are considered a crime against peace and mankind. The Preamble to the United Nations Charter also points out that that organisation was established with the aim of saving

future generations from the scourge of war. And this in a period when the population of the world is considerably greater than it was in the days of Malthus or Masaryk. Masarykism's agreement with the misanthropic ideas of Malthusianism only shows the hypocrisy of its claim to being an ideology of democracy and humanism.

Let us now return to what Masaryk had to say about the geographical environment. We might recall that he claimed that Marx and Engels considered the geographical environment a driving force.¹ The fact is, however, that Marx and Engels never spoke of it as a driving force, but only as one of the necessary material conditions of the life of society.

This was how Marx spoke of it in various places in the first volume of *Capital*, and it was the geographical environment that Engels was referring to when he said that man belongs to nature and exists in its midst. Man derives from this environment everything he needs for life: air, water, food, materials for shelter, materials for clothing, etc. In general, Marx considered earth, water, etc., as the universal material conditions of human life and production.

It is perfectly obvious that having failed to distinguish among the categories of historical materialism and seeing in it only so-called Economism, Masaryk criticised his own revisionist conception of historical materialism and nothing more. In doing so, he ascribed to Marxism an absurd theory of driving forces which he himself concocted and into which he included the two above-mentioned material conditions of the life of society.

Let us now turn to the third material condition which determines the historical development of society, namely, the mode of production.

After quoting in detail from the famous classical definition of historical materialism given by Marx in the Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*,² Masa-

¹ See Masaryk, op. cit., p. 241.

² Ibid., pp. 126-27.

ryk, once he began to analyse it, revealed his complete lack of understanding of it. He got the impression somehow, for example, that the mode of production and relations of production are "expressions of one and the same idea",¹ whereas, in fact, the mode of production is a category which includes within itself the relations of production and also the forces of production. In the category "superstructure", Masaryk saw only a stylistically unfortunate verbal expression; he completely missed the scientific meaning of this concept.² He also declared untrue—incidentally, without stating his grounds—the proposition that social being determines social consciousness, thereby underscoring his own idealist position in the understanding of the life and development of society.³ The only thing he was clear about was that historical materialism was unacceptable to him from a *class* and *social* point of view, and this is what underlay his entire revisionist criticism of historical materialism, his distortion of its propositions and his unwillingness to understand it.

It is fitting at this point to refer to Plekhanov's criticism of Masaryk in relation to the latter's revision and distortion of the propositions of historical materialism. Plekhanov drew attention, for example, to the following passage in Masaryk's book: "The question remains as follows: do the relations of production, animal needs, or however else these relations may be called, constitute the ultimate driving force of history?... Is this the main force? Is it the only driving force? Is it really that creative force?"⁴

Plekhanov's reaction to this was as follows: "Masaryk considers it possible to *render production relations* as '*animal needs*'. Now there is a pearl of pearls!

"As we read the section that Mr. Masaryk devoted to historical materialism, we were often reminded of our good old Mr. Kareyev. Mr. Masaryk, who knows Russian and often

¹ Ibid., p. 127.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., p. 128.

⁴ Ibid., p. 166.

quotes Russian writers, is evidently much obliged to Mr. Kareyev. He borrowed many of his wonderful 'formulas' from him. Except that he fixed them up and augmented them, making them heavy-worded and pedantic. He also borrowed a little from the 'formulas' of Mr. Nikolai Mikhailovsky and other Russian 'critics' of historical materialism. But, of course, to all of these borrowings he also added a sizeable element of verbosity and pedantry.

"With all these borrowings and this verbosity and pedantry, Mr. Masaryk has turned out in his 'criticism' of Marx's views on history to be very much like... Mr. Eduard Bernstein. *Les beaux esprits se rencontrent*."¹

Plekhanov thus perceived that there was much in common between Bernsteinism and Masarykism. Indeed, the common character of the two manifests itself first of all in the fact that Masaryk and Bernstein both came out with criticism and revision of Marxism; they both found Marxist materialism and Marxist dialectics, which considers revolution to be a natural phenomenon in social development, distasteful. In this connection, criticism of Masarykism and exposure of its attempts to distort Marxism are an important and necessary part of the continuing struggle against revisionism.

But to return to Masaryk's views on historical materialism.

Masaryk held that historical materialism recognises only economic life as having any real existence, while all the superstructure categories are supposed to be considered illusory. In his words, "...for people and for society, only economic relations, or to be more exact, production relations, have real meaning.... Ideology—religion, ethics, philosophy, art, the state—are only a makeweight, an addition to the production relations, they are unreal, illusory and have only symptomatic meaning".² In another part of his book, Masaryk had this to say: "...Marx's materialism is entirely rationalistic. There is no room in his theory for sentiment. By

¹ G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., pp. 680-81.

² Masaryk, op. cit., p. 135.

removing human feelings from his theory he throws ethics, and along with it art, almost philosophy and, in general, all human activity, overboard as empty ideology—he has pardoned only economics.”¹

With statements such as this Masaryk was not describing historical materialism; he was presenting a revisionist distortion of it. In no way can it be construed that historical materialism throws out ideology and all human activity in general, or that it considers superstructure categories to be illusions. Can the state, for example, which under capitalism is an instrument of extra-economic force, be called an illusion, or social revolution be considered an illusory phenomenon? What Masaryk had to say about historical materialism, therefore, was of his own revisionist manufacture. For us to expose this kind of distortion for what it is we have only to refer to what Engels had to say in answer to similar accusations. In a letter to Bloch, for example, he wrote:

“...According to the materialist conception of history, the *ultimately* determining element in history is the production and reproduction of real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. Hence if somebody twists this into saying that the economic element is the *only* determining one, he transforms that proposition into a meaningless, abstract, senseless phrase.”² Engels went on to explain that “the economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure—political forms of the class struggle and its results, to wit: constitutions established by the victorious class after a successful battle, etc., juridical forms, ... political, juristic and philosophical theories, religious views ... also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their *form*. There is an interaction of all these elements in which, amid all the endless host of accidents ... the economic movement finally asserts itself as necessary. ...

¹ Ibid., p. 119.

² K. Marx and F. Engels. *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 487.

"We make our history ourselves, but, in the first place, under very definite assumptions and conditions. Among these the economic ones are ultimately decisive. But the political ones, etc., and indeed even the traditions which haunt human minds also play a part, although not the decisive one."¹

Engels commented on the same question in letters to Schmidt and Mehring. We take the following excerpt from a letter to Schmidt:

"If therefore Barth supposes that we deny any and every reaction of the political, etc., reflexes of the economic movement upon the movement itself, he is simply tilting at windmills. He has only got to look at Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire*, which deals almost exclusively with the *particular* part played by political struggles and events, of course within their *general* dependence upon economic conditions. Or *Capital*, the section on the working day, for instance, where legislation, which is surely a political act, has such a trenchant effect. Or the section on the history of the bourgeoisie. (Chapter XXIV.) Or why do we fight for the political dictatorship of the proletariat if political power is economically impotent? Force (that is, state power) is also an economic power!"²

Similar explanations concerning historical materialism are to be found in Engels' letter to F. Mehring.³

Further comment on the groundlessness of Masaryk's false reformist statements regarding historical materialism is hardly needed after such a clear explanation of its propositions as given by Engels.

We may now move from the question of historical materialism to statements made by Masaryk about Marx's economic theory, that is, Marxist political economy. He began one of his pamphlets with a criticism of this economic theory stating that for that purpose he would naturally take up

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., p. 487.

² Ibid., p. 494.

³ Ibid., p. 497.

Marx's chief work, *Capital*, the more so because as soon as the third volume was published there was a lively debate around the question of whether the views expressed in that volume contradicted the theory set forth in the first and basic volume.

"The theory of value," Masaryk wrote, "briefly says the following: all use values or commodities, whether we buy them or sell them, receive their value from labour. Human labour is embodied, materialised in the commodity. In the pre-capitalist period, every worker worked independently and produced as much as he needed. In the capitalist period, the worker lost his independence, and his labour became a commodity; the worker sells this commodity to the capitalist—in other words, the latter exploits the former."

In the first place, use values as such are not the same thing as commodities, and to speak of "use-values or commodities" is a sign of illiteracy in economics. A use-value, that is, some product of labour, becomes a commodity only when it also assumes an exchange-value.¹ A commodity, according to Marxist theory, is an article produced for exchange, for the market, and not just for personal consumption by the one who produces it.

In the second place, Masaryk made it look as if Marx believed that one man's exploitation of another's labour occurred only under capitalism.

In the third place, according to Marxism, it is not labour, but labour power, that is, the commodity which the worker sells to the capitalist. One of the fundamental propositions of Marxist economic science consists of this distinction between labour and labour power. Indeed, if the worker sold his labour, then in accordance with the laws of commodity production he would have to receive its full "value", that is, the value produced by the worker's labour. In that case, what would be left for the capitalist? Where would be the source of surplus value, the theory of which, as Lenin put it,

¹ See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, pp. 41-42, 47-48, 64-65, 72, 84.

is the cornerstone of Marxist political economy? Finally, if the worker sold his labour and not his labour power as a commodity, there could be no exploitation of hired labour according to the laws of commodity production.¹

In the fourth place, labour (work), while it is the source, the creator of the value of commodities, does not itself have a value and cannot function as a commodity. Marx said in this regard that "that which comes directly face to face with the possessor of money on the market is in fact not labour, but the labourer. What the latter sells is his labour-power. As soon as his labour actually begins, it has already ceased to belong to him; it can therefore no longer be sold by him. Labour is the substance, and the immanent measure of value, but *has itself no value*."²

Consequently, the theory of value presented by Masaryk was not the Marxist theory of value, for according to Marxism labour under capitalism does not become a commodity, and the worker sells as a commodity not his labour but his labour power, that is, his capacity for work. Otherwise, there would be no exploitation and no surplus value for the capitalist to appropriate.³

Masaryk's distortion of what Marx's economic theory has to say on this question prevented him from comprehending the category "surplus value", the cornerstone of Marxist economic teaching. He even thought he saw—as, incidentally, do some present-day bourgeois economists—a contradiction between the theory of surplus value as developed in the first volume of *Capital* and the category of profit which Marx analysed in the third volume of that work.

All of Masaryk's assertions and his references to other revisionists were directed primarily against the theory of surplus value. Masaryk's hostility towards surplus value was noted by Plekhanov: "Masaryk very much dislikes Marx's theory of value and *especially of surplus value*. It could

¹ See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, pp. 540, 541-42.

² Ibid., p. 537.

³ Ibid., pp. 535-36 538-39, 540, 541.

not be otherwise, of course."¹ This is all that Plekhanov said, evidently feeling no need to go into the matter of specific distortions. But in Plekhanov's "it could not be otherwise, of course" we have the crux of the class appraisal of Masarykism.

Now back to Masaryk and his "objective" presentation of Marxism. "The worker," he wrote, "produces surplus value for the capitalist.

"In contrast to this theory of surplus value, the third volume of *Capital* offers another version, which is the usual one in this sense. According to the theory found in the first volume, the one just outlined, surplus value arises due to the transformation of capital into labour power ('variable capital'); the third volume, however, holds to the data of experience which teaches that surplus value—profit—is not at all conditioned upon surplus labour performed by the worker. . . . This obviously stands in contradiction to the theory in the first volume, according to which surplus value and profit are created only by labour."

Without commenting on the imprecise terminology, let us analyse the essence of this passage.

It is quite incorrect to say that in the third volume of *Capital* Marx did not, as he did in the first volume, consider the surplus labour of the worker to be the source of surplus value. We have only to quote Marx's own remarks on this subject to refute this revisionist fabrication. At one point in the third volume of *Capital* Marx wrote: "that portion of the commodity-value making up the surplus-value does not cost the capitalist anything simply because it costs the labourer unpaid labour."² In another place in the same volume he said: "...The profit, such as it is represented here, is thus the same as surplus-value, only in a mystified form that is nonetheless a necessary outgrowth of the capitalist mode of production."³

¹ G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., p. 681.

² K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, Moscow, 1966, p. 26.

³ Ibid., p. 36.

In revealing the relationship between the rate of surplus value and the rate of profit, Marx wrote the following: "The rate of surplus-value measured against the variable capital is called rate of surplus-value. The rate of surplus-value measured against the total capital is called rate of profit. These are two different measurements of the same entity, and owing to the difference of the two standards of measurement they express different proportions or relations of this entity."¹

Clearly, Marx did not change his views on surplus value; in the third volume his position on surplus value was the same as it was in the first.² And there are many other places in the third volume where Marx stressed that the one and only source of surplus value and profit is the unpaid labour of the worker.³

It is quite obvious, therefore, that Masaryk himself manufactured the contradiction between the first and third volumes of *Capital* by distorting Marx's views on surplus value and profit.

Masaryk's subsequent references to Bernstein⁴ and other "theorists of socialism" (read: "experts in revisionism") who agreed with his criticism of the theory of surplus value, did not prove that there is any contradiction between the first and third volumes of *Capital*, but only indicated that there were no class contradictions between Masaryk and Bernstein, that in this instance Masaryk was just as much of a revisionist as Bernstein, and that, therefore, they were equally unconvincing and guilty of distorting Marx's views on surplus value and profit.

¹ K. Marx, op. cit., p. 43.

² See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, pp. 212-20 *et seq.*

³ See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, pp. 26, 30, 36-37, 42, 43 *et seq.*

⁴ Referring to the revisionist Bernstein, Masaryk wrote: "The theorists of socialism do not deny contradiction between the first and third volumes. Bernstein admits that Marx's theory of surplus value is actually insufficiently clear and that this theory, as advanced in the first volume, is incomplete without the explanations in the third volume, and is therefore a little strange."

What was it about surplus value that so annoyed Masaryk and Bernstein? What was the real social reason for their attacking this concept? An analysis of what this concept expresses and reveals will make this clear.

Surplus value reveals the production relations between the working class and the class of capitalists as consisting of the *exploitation* of the worker by the capitalist; and the rate of surplus value expresses the degree of this exploitation. In the first volume of *Capital*, Marx wrote: "The rate of surplus-value is . . . an exact expression for the degree of exploitation of labour-power by capital, or of the labourer by the capitalist."¹ Hence, surplus value reveals the fact that economic relations under capitalism are relations between classes wherein the capitalist class exploits the workers. Surplus value also shows how and at whose expense the private property of the capitalist takes shape and grows: the capitalist appropriates for himself part of the value created by the worker and thereby augments his own capital.

Being an ideologist of the bourgeoisie, Masaryk could not, of course, find the concept of surplus value to his liking; indeed, he did everything he could to conceal the essence of capitalist production relations from the workers. There is no question that Masaryk opposed the idea of surplus value not for scientific reasons, but for class and social reasons.

These same social considerations also determined Masaryk's position regarding profit. Profit in no way embarrassed him and he recognised it as the "data of experience". Why did Masaryk have no objections to profit? Because profit does not reveal the relations between the working class and the capitalists; because it expresses the relation of surplus value to the entire sum of advanced capital, and seems on the surface to come not only from the labour of the worker, that is, not only from variable capital, but also from the other parts of capital, that is, from the means of production, raw materials, etc. Hence the form of profit conceals the

¹ K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 218.

relations of exploitation existing between the capitalist and the worker; it camouflages the real source of the increase of value and, consequently, of the bourgeoisie's capital. Needless to say, this economic category was quite acceptable to Masaryk and his class positions, and that is why he tried so hard to find a "contradiction" between the theory of surplus value, which reveals the class relations between capitalists and workers, and the theory of profit, which camouflages these relations. Moreover, as we have seen, he tried to resolve his invented "contradiction" in favour of profit. It may be of interest to note that Marx foresaw that the *bourgeoisie* would take just such a position with respect to profit and surplus value. "Surplus-value," he wrote in the third volume of *Capital*, "and rate of surplus-value are, relatively, the invisible and unknown essence that wants investigating, while rate of profit and therefore the appearance of surplus-value in the form of profit are revealed on the surface of the phenomenon.

"So far as the individual capitalist is concerned, it is evident that he is *only interested* in the relation of the surplus-value, or the excess value at which he sells his commodities, to the *total capital* advanced for the production of the commodities, while the *specific relationship* and inner connection of this surplus with the *various* components of capital fail to interest him, and it is, moreover, rather *in his interests to draw the veil over* this specific relationship and this intrinsic connection [emphasis added—M.S.]."¹

Thus it is perfectly clear that Masaryk's attempts to find a "contradiction" between the first and third volumes of *Capital*, and his revisionist attacks against the theory of surplus value were based not on scientific considerations, but on the class and social considerations of Masaryk as an ideologist of the bourgeoisie. It is obvious that, once again, there are no scientific grounds whatever for his revisionism. The latter rests entirely on the social and class positions of

¹ K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 43.

the bourgeoisie, which, in keeping with its reactionary nature in the period of imperialism, is not interested in any kind of scientific analysis that would reveal the conditions of its dominance and the secret of its exploitation of the working people.

3. REVISIONISM IN THE THEORY OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE AND THE "THEORY" OF CLASS "COLLABORATION" AND REFORMISM

Being a revisionist and falsifier of Marxist teaching as a whole, Masaryk naturally remained true to form when it came to the Marxist theory of the class struggle, and it was in this question that the bourgeois class essence of Masarykism came out in its most open form. Although Masaryk could not deny the existence of classes in capitalist society, he nonetheless did deny the existence of two basic antagonistic classes—the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

His tactic—aimed at disuniting the workers' movement—was to treat the working class *not* as a *class*, but as a large number of separate professional groups of workers. Moreover, he also classified working people according to their level of education, into the intelligent, the less educated and the uneducated.¹ His objective in introducing this jumble into the definition of the proletariat was to avoid the social implications of the working-class question and to treat it as a question having to do only with the professional and educational needs of individual workers or groups of workers. Thus, instead of speaking in terms of the class interests of the workers, instead of dealing with the workers' struggle against exploitation, instead of raising the question of a reorganisation of society by the working class, Masaryk spoke of the professional interests of workers and of their education and training—all within the framework of a capitalist system left intact.

¹ See Masaryk, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

Masaryk introduced even greater confusion and falsification into the concept of class struggle with the following "analysis": "Once we have spoken of the class struggle we should ask whether we are supposed to consider the class struggle permanent or not. In his work against Proudhon, Marx speaks of struggle as the general motive force in history; later, he and Engels express the opinion that the class struggle began with civilisation and that it will come to an end in communist society. So the way we are to understand the matter is that class struggle is only a temporary and even short-lived episode in history, while the struggle between *individuals* (in the *Darwinian sense*) is universal and continues throughout history [emphasis added—M.S.]."¹

With statements such as this Masaryk exposed his own lack of understanding of the category "class struggle". Marxism has never put the question of class struggle on a level with the struggle "between *individuals* in the *Darwinian sense*". On the contrary, Marxism is flatly opposed to applying Darwinian propositions about the struggle for existence in the biological world to society; it views any such application as vulgar biologism. Nor has Marxism ever viewed the so-called universal struggle between individuals as being class struggle. The struggle between individuals is not a Marxist proposition; it is a conception used by Hobbes and Locke.

Finally, it is outright distortion of the Marxist theory of class struggle to say that it contrasts the class struggle as a temporary phenomenon with the struggle between individuals as a universal and eternal phenomenon.

Masaryk stood on the unscientific positions of social Darwinism in his interpretation of the theory of class struggle. His own statements bear this out clearly. "The term 'struggle'," he wrote, "is widely used nowadays; we all say, for example, that life is a struggle and nothing but a struggle. The *struggle for existence* is a pet expression.

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 235.

"If we look closely, however, it turns out that the word 'struggle' has many meanings. For example, when we hear this word we often think of the various kinds and degrees of competition between *individuals* and classes ... and not only in the economic sphere, but everywhere.

"Modern man displays a certain anxiety, a certain dissatisfaction; he is waging a struggle against fate and against history, and this struggle is not a struggle against specific individuals and classes—it is philosophical, metaphysical [emphasis added—*M.S.*]."¹

Here again Masaryk revealed his own theoretical helplessness and non-understanding of the class struggle as a *social* phenomenon. Instead of getting to the social essence of the class struggle, Masaryk occupied himself with the semantics of the *word* "struggle". Clearly, this kind of juggling does not speak favourably of Masaryk's knowledge of the theory of classes and the class struggle. His attempt to analyse the entire theoretical framework of sociology by examining the meaning of the word "struggle" only showed his inability to get to the substance of the question he was dealing with. He treated the Darwinian proposition about the struggle for existence—which has no relation to man and human society anyway—simply as a pet expression. However, all of Masaryk's profuse talk about the struggle for existence in the plant and animal world has absolutely no relation to Marx's theory of class struggle and revolution.

In the first place, the Darwinian propositions on the struggle for existence are fundamentally inapplicable to human society—they are biological and not sociological propositions.

In the second place, for natural science the "struggle for existence" is not merely a pet expression, but a profound scientific discovery made by Darwin.

In the third place, it is only with vulgarisers of sociology

¹ Ibid., p. 236.

that the "struggle for existence" is a pet expression and one that is applied to human society.

Masaryk held the view that the "struggle for existence" is applicable to human society. He interpreted the struggle taking place in society as being primarily the *struggle of individuals*, as competition between *individuals*. And then he ultimately resolved this into a struggle against *fate* and *history* waged by people who feel a "certain anxiety and dissatisfaction". Here he added his idealistic psychological individualism to his vulgar social Darwinism by again replacing sociology with psychology, by replacing social, class struggle with the struggle between individuals with their inherent anxiety and dissatisfaction. All this has to do with psychology, not with sociology, just as the psychological state of a person is always a question of psychology and not of sociology. We also find here an attempt to replace a question relative to *society* with a question relative to the *individual*. And finally, in the statements quoted above Masaryk again spoke as an idealist, trying to present the social struggle of classes as the struggle of separate individuals—and this only in a *philosophical* and *literary* form. For it was in this connection that, after advancing the general idea quoted above about a "philosophical and metaphysical" struggle, Masaryk proceeded to list outstanding philosophers and writers.¹

It can be seen from the above that Masaryk did everything possible to distort the Marxist theory of the class struggle. He failed to even mention that Marxism recognises not only an economic form of class struggle, but also political and ideological forms. He said nothing about the fact that Marxism perceives behind the struggle of individual philosophers and writers not simply the struggle of individual people, but the struggle of the spokesmen for different classes, that is, in essence, the class struggle. Needless to say, all of Masaryk's revisionist distortions of the Marxist

¹ Masaryk, op. cit., p. 242.

theory of the class struggle are in keeping with the definite *class* interests of the bourgeoisie which Masaryk took upon himself to defend in the sphere of ideology and politics.¹

Having nicely disposed of the class struggle by replacing it essentially with struggle between individuals, Masaryk proceeded to advance the idea of co-operation between the members of various classes—co-operation based on a so-called feeling of honest humaneness. "I state with confidence that people belonging to different classes also have a feeling of *mutuality*, that generally speaking there is a *feeling of honest humaneness* among *people* and among *classes*, not to an especially high degree, it is true, but nonetheless to a higher degree than the various kinds of materialists suppose. This feeling of humaneness also has an influence on social relations, and a marked influence...."

"Further, I assert that relations between people and between classes are also regulated to a significant extent by reason; I say that both now and much earlier many people are giving and have given serious and honest thought to the state of society and its future, and that their ideas have had and continue to have an extremely noticeable impact. I say that even the *worker*, for example, realises that *his interests* are to a considerable extent *identical to the interests of his employer* [emphasis added—M. S.]."²

In this entire "humanistic" sermon about class mutuality, about co-operation between classes based on feelings of honest humaneness, etc., there is actually no real humanism whatever.

Under capitalism—and Masaryk had primarily capitalism in mind, since he spoke of the interests of the worker and the employer—to speak of a mutuality between people of different classes and of their mutual feelings of humane-

¹ Masaryk defended the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie in politics and economics primarily after the establishment of an independent Czechoslovakia in 1918, when he was made President of the Czechoslovak Republic.

² Masaryk, op. cit., p. 237.

ness, is to speak of something that does not exist. The entire system of private property, including private capitalist property, is immoral; it always uses non-humane means and pursues equally non-humane objectives. Private property, including capitalist private property, exists on the basis of the *exploitation of man by man*, and it grows only as this kind of exploitation grows and intensifies. The capitalist is motivated by the irresistible desire to increase his capital, otherwise he ceases being a capitalist and is reduced to bankruptcy in the competition with other members of his class. But since the source of the growth of capitalist property is the unpaid labour of the wage worker (we discussed this in the preceding section), the dominant motive of the capitalist is his desire to increase and intensify exploitation. How then can one speak of feelings of honest humaneness in this case, when the very economic basis of private property, including capitalist private property, is, morally and for the workers, inhumane? Therefore, Masaryk's sermon about the feeling of honest humaneness and about the identity of the worker's and the capitalist's interests, his sermon portraying the exploitation of the worker by the capitalist as mutual co-operation with a definite feeling of honest humaneness, was in effect a dishonest sermon preaching the preservation of exploitation and the exploitative system.

Similar class considerations underlie Masaryk's protestations against materialism, since materialism, particularly Marxist materialism, reveals the material, economic basis of the inhumane ethics of the exploitative system, and points out what economic basis must first be eliminated in order to arrive at genuine humanism, which can arise only on the basis of establishing the socialist system with its rejection of the exploitation of man by man, of one class by another and of one nation by another.

Masaryk's propositions also reveal the individualism and idealism of his positions: 1) he laid emphasis upon the relations between people as something independent from

relations between classes; 2) he singled out "reason"¹ as the force which regulates the relations between classes and between people. In the first instance, we see the individualism of Masarykism, and in the second, its psychological idealism. It never occurred to Masaryk, the idealist, to ask what it is that guides the "reasoning" of people in their relations with each other. The fact is that the "reasoning" of people is determined by their interests, including economic interests. The "reasoning" of the members of the exploiting class always conforms to the interests of exploitation and the "reasoning" of the exploited conforms to the interests of the struggle against exploitation. Any suggestion that "reason" is an independent regulating force is empty idealist verbiage, used in this instance to portray an exploitative society as being a rational society.

As we have pointed out, Masaryk stood on revisionist positions as he distorted the Marxist theory of the class struggle and countered it with the individualistic conception of "humanistically" motivated interpersonal co-operation within the framework of an exploitative system. All this reveals the demagogic aims of Masarykism to protect the interests of capitalist exploitation.

Let us now turn to a question that proved to be more irksome to Masaryk than any other—the question of revolution.

The struggle of antagonistic classes in an exploitative society culminates in social revolution; revolution is the highest stage of the class struggle. Since Masaryk was fundamentally opposed to the class struggle, it follows that he was also against its highest stage. And it is precisely because

¹ "Reason" is understood here as a philosophical idealist category and not in the sense that in human society all relations are relations of thinking, conscious beings. Masaryk gave the concept "reason" an independent meaning and set it apart as an independent regulating category. In reality, however, "reason" (consciousness, thinking) is inseparable from the people endowed with it, and it manifests itself in all relations among people. But this does not make "reason" some kind of independent regulating category; it simply means that we are speaking of relations among people and not among animals.

revolution is the highest point of the class struggle that Masaryk objected to it most of all. On this score, as in other questions, Masaryk also endeavoured to distort everything and approached the problem from a religious-idealist position by advancing various "moral" slogans. He said that his objective was to make the problem of revolution understood in its entirety and in all of its seriousness, so that, in particular, it become clear that although Marx and Engels called for revolution, they did not substantiate their demand philosophically, as the seriousness of the matter required.

That the problem of revolution is extremely serious requires no proof. But that the Marxist theory of revolution is not substantiated philosophically is, of course, a groundless assertion, and Masaryk himself refuted it by his own struggle against Marxist dialectical philosophy, which, as was pointed out earlier, is a veritable "algebra of revolution". Therefore, it is not the theory of revolution—the necessity of revolution unavoidably flows from Marxist dialectical philosophy—but Masaryk's rejection of revolution that lacks philosophical substantiation. Apparently sensing the flimsiness of his philosophical position, Masaryk turned to the revisionist Bernstein for help, expecting, perhaps, that rejection of revolution would become more philosophically sound if it came from two revisionists instead of one. Thus, he laid special emphasis on how decisively and clearly Bernstein—who no longer believed in "Marx's catastrophe"—rejected revolution.

Did Masaryk's reference to Bernstein make his rejection of revolution any more philosophically sound? No, it only went to show that Masarykism was the same kind of revisionism and reformism as was Bernsteinism. Furthermore, Masaryk was trying to make a philosophical argument out of something that had to do not with philosophy but with a very practical social question. The demand for revolution is not primarily a demand of some theory or philosophy; it is the demand of the practical social life of a class exploiting society. That the Marxist theory of revolution is not

merely a philosophical concept but a truly scientific reflection of the laws of social development, of the class struggle and the socialist revolution, has been proved not only by the Great October Revolution in Russia in 1917, but also by the revolution that took place in Czechoslovakia itself in the postwar period.

To expose the revisionist fabrications concerning the Marxist theory of socialist revolution it is important to expose the various ways in which Marxism was falsified. A typical falsification in this regard was Masaryk's article "Palacký and Engels—On the Tribal Basis of Primitive Society", published in the *Worker's Calendar for 1896*. As we know, the revisionists became especially active during the period of temporary ideological stagnation in which the workers' movement found itself at the end of the 19th century as a result of the influx of petty-bourgeois elements and the growth of the labour aristocracy segment. The revisionists in the German Social-Democratic Party had falsified an article written by Engels as a preface to Marx's work *The Class Struggles in France* (1895), thereby abusing Engels' prestige to reinforce their own anti-revolutionary ideology. In July 1895, Masaryk's magazine *Naše doba* printed an article, entitled "Social-Democracy Against Revolution", containing excerpts from the falsified version of Engels' preface. The article's introduction stressed the "significant" changes "taking place" in the development of Social-Democracy in regard to problems of political tactics. "Of all the statements recently made by Social-Democrats," the article said, "the statements of Frederick Engels have attracted the greatest attention. Engels has published an early historical work by Marx devoted to the events of 1848, prefacing it with an introduction in which he writes about political tactics. Meanwhile, another outstanding Social-Democratic leader, Wilhelm Liebknecht, has written in the Viennese *Die Zeit* on the subject of universal suffrage, pointing out, in agreement with Engels, that this right is the Social-Democrats' best and most effective

political means of struggle, and that once they win this right, they will never dream of revolution. We cite here the views of Engels, who, in the above-mentioned preface to Marx's work, contrasts modern parliamentary activity with obsolete revolutionary tactics. Engels' ideas are highly instructive. From them it follows that the only correct tactic for modern politics is the tactic of work, and that for this tactic we will not have an insufficient number of radicals. At the same time, this shows that the humanitarian tactic (for that is what we are dealing with) is indeed modern and practical."

In this way, Masaryk took an active part in the attack on Marxism that the international revisionists began with their falsification of Engels' article. Masaryk's organ *Naše doba*, referring in yet another issue to the falsified version of Engels' article, wrote: "The ideas expressed by Engels also show what a change has taken place in Social-Democracy since 1849: at that time, young Engels was an 'adjutant' in the Baden uprising, when he took a direct part in three encounters; but now, he is a courageous 'general' (he was so dubbed for his famous articles on the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, in which he predicted France's defeat) and is writing against revolution."

Thus, Masaryk tried to make Engels look like a real reformist who viewed his own and Marx's revolutionary ardour in 1848 as the misguided passion of youth. The speech he delivered on universal suffrage in 1895 at the Prague Political Workers' Club was a good example of Masaryk's active work to undermine the workers' movement. Even then Masaryk wanted to convince the Prague Socialists that he was right in his basic premise that human imperfection was the principal cause of social ills and that, therefore, the main way to combat social ills was through the moral re-education of the people. In 1895, he advanced this proposition in connection with his assessment of parliamentarism, saying that the shortcomings of parliamentarism were not to be blamed on parliament but on the voters,

whose imperfection was reflected in the work of parliament, and that improvements in parliamentarism would take place simultaneously with improvements in the moral education of man. In the latter part of the year 1895, Masaryk published the above-mentioned article entitled "Palacký and Engels—On the Tribal Basis of Primitive Society", the purpose of which was to suggest agreement of views between Palacký, an exponent of the Czech liberal bourgeoisie, and Frederick Engels, a leader of the international workers' movement. It was a policy of propagandising (as if on behalf of Engels) the ideas of Masaryk's "humanistic" philosophy.

It would be wrong, however, to suppose that Masaryk at one time embraced a "genuine humanism" which he later, after becoming President, betrayed. Masaryk's "humanism" of later years was a direct continuation of the religion-based "humanism" he began preaching in the late 1870s and which already then was designed to paralyse the class struggle of the proletariat.

Masaryk's "humanistic philosophy" and his conception of democracy were aimed at preventing in every way possible the transfer of power from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat by revolutionary means. To this end he not only made hypocritical references to the "bloody nature" of revolution, but continuously repeated his assertion that the social order could not be improved because the people were not yet sufficiently mature morally, and that only the new religion of man's "moral improvement" could lead to a solution of the crisis. Similarly, in a number of his other works of the 1880s and 1890s, Masaryk expounded the idea that any reforms whatever in the social system were possible only if people became better morally. And whenever revolution loomed, Masaryk always repeated: "Just don't get agitated, be reasonable!" His slogan "Agitation Is Not a Programme!" became popular among the Czech bourgeoisie. Masaryk's religion, as any other religion, pursued the aim of making the people humble, submissive and reconciled to oppression.

Masaryk, however, did not employ the usual clerical obscurantism; he even spoke out against clericalism and called instead for a "free" religion with a "new" God, without the antiquated elements of cult and faith which contradict not only science and culture, but ordinary consciousness as well. But because of its refinement, this religion posed an even greater danger to the interests of the working class than patent clericalism.

Masaryk declared that his "humanism" was identical to the religious ethic of "love thy neighbour". Indeed, characteristic of both is their use of the concept of "universal love" to obscure the irreconcilable class contradictions of the times. It was in the name of "humanism" that Masaryk repeatedly appealed to the workers to work in harmony with the capitalists. Exactly what he had in mind when he said that "the meaning of Czech history is humanism", we learn from the last part of his work *The Czech Question*. Having given a distorted account of Czech history and having misinterpreted the Hussite movement by treating it as an exclusively religious movement and denying its revolutionary class essence, Masaryk drew the conclusion that the spirit of Czech history demanded concord between the workers and the bourgeoisie. He exclaimed with pathos: "It is a matter of all of us feeling that we are brothers." Workers were called upon to "suppress their egoism" for the sake of "loving their neighbour" (meaning the bourgeoisie). Similarly, in his *Ideals of Humanism*, we find that Masaryk posited a "common ethic which reconciles the rich man and the poor".

Behind the façade of Masaryk's "humanism" lay his desire to perpetuate the bourgeois system of exploitation. The genuinely humane goal of the working class and of all working people, however, is entirely different: it is to fight the exploiters, to overthrow their domination and to eliminate the exploitation of man by man.

4. MASARYK'S ANTI-NATIONAL POSITION IN THE NATIONAL QUESTION AND IN HIS CONCEPTION OF CULTURE

The essence of revisionism, whether it be Masarykist pseudo-humanism or Bernstein's kind of revisionism, has always been the rejection of the revolutionary struggle of the working class against capitalism.

Revisionism manifests itself most clearly whenever some problem becomes, under given circumstances, particularly pressing and urgent. Hence, in Austria-Hungary, where the national question played a significant role, a revisionist theory for the solution of this problem was advanced. The theory originated with Bauer and Renner, but found its concrete expression in the Brno programme of national and cultural autonomy which was adopted at the Austrian Social-Democratic congress of 1899. That programme, which squeezed the nations being oppressed by Austrian imperialism into the framework of the Austrian monarchy, was an instrument by which the bourgeoisie in the Hapsburg monarchy held sway over the working class and, by playing on nationalistic sentiments, impaired its unity. In the 1890s, the Czech nationalistic leaders, together with German nationalistic elements, were in the front ranks of those who advocated separatism and spread nationalistic tendencies within Austrian Social-Democracy. The "practicalness" of Social-Democracy that manifested itself especially in the solution of the national question was quite to Masaryk's liking and helped to boost his influence in the workers' movement. Actually, this practicalness meant splitting away the political practice of Social-Democrats from Marxist theory and led towards the spontaneous adoption of the deep-rooted, time-tested, "practical" methods of the bourgeoisie. In theory, the Social-Democrats in Austria adhered to internationalism and spoke out against national oppression. However, they did not understand the connection between the national liberation struggle of oppressed peoples

and the struggle of the working class, and gravitated towards the "practical" point of view of the bourgeoisie. The revisionists took advantage of this situation and developed a "theoretically sound" and "practical"—that is, essentially bourgeois—programme for the solution of the national question: it rejected self-determination in the national question just as the revisionists rejected socialist revolution in the workers' movement. For Masaryk, a Czech bourgeois politician, this "practical" and "realistic" programme was just the thing.

He worked hard to make use of the national question for purposes of revisionism. Just as in *The Social Question* and certain other works he tried to revise Marxism under the guise of "humanism", etc., so in his works on the national question, above all in his book *The Czech Question*, he defended revisionist and reformist positions, declaring the revolutionary national liberation movement to be a regressive phenomenon.

In *The Czech Question* and later in *Jan Hus* and other works, he counter-balanced the openly reactionary historical views expounded by official historians, one of the most famous of which was Josef Pekář, with his demonstrative "adoption" of the traditional national view of Czech history, according to which the Hussite movement and national renaissance was seen as its golden age, and White Hill¹ as the era of its deepest decline and darkness.

However, Masaryk stripped this view of its revolutionary essence, because in his interpretation the driving force of Czech history was not the popular masses fighting for their interests in the Hussite movement and in the period of national renaissance, but individual personalities—theologians and ideologists—who, in his opinion, turned this period into

¹ At White Hill, the Czech army, consisting largely of mercenaries commanded by foreign generals, was defeated by the imperial army of the Austrian Hapsburg monarchy, as a result of which Bohemia lost her national sovereignty and ceased to exist as an independent state. Three centuries of national bondage began.

the "apogee" of Czech national history through the power of their ideas. According to Masaryk, the Hussite movement was primarily a religious movement created by Hus, and the national renaissance movement was inspired by scholars and Protestant pastors. The workers' movement, according to Masaryk, was also the child of scholarly thought, and what had to be done now was to deliver the Czech people and the Czech working class from the excessively "worldly" and "one-sided, vulgar" material interests pursued by the workers' movement and to direct them once again towards a "higher goal".

One of Masaryk's main objectives in the national question was, again, revisionism and distortion of Marxism. An example of this was the above-mentioned article on Palacký and Engels, in which he maintained that Morgan and Engels, as well as Palacký, perceived in the distant past a paradise and a model for the future.

First, Masaryk "proved" that Palacký and Engels held similar views, and then proceeded to draw a conclusion which revealed the political goal he was pursuing in his article. He said that he was speaking above all of the meaning of the general development of mankind and the development of individual peoples, and it was precisely from that standpoint that the similarity between Palacký's and Engels' views was important and valuable, since it was clear that both were striving towards the same goal: liberty, equality and fraternity.

Thus, Masaryk had Engels embracing some kind of vague humanism in the spirit of the hackneyed slogan of liberty, equality, fraternity. This was Engels à la Masaryk. The political aim of Masaryk's article was to attract the Czech workers to his, Masaryk's side. He had Palacký (à la Masaryk) as the ideological basis for the nationalistic bourgeoisie, and Engels (à la Masaryk) for the workers.

Masaryk pursued the same revisionist goal in his book *The Social Question*, in which he devoted an entire section (under the heading of "Nationalism and Internationalism")

to arguments allegedly showing that Marxism is alien to national interests, since it puts proletarian internationalism above nationalism and class struggle above national peace. Distorting Marxism, Masaryk wrote that historical materialism reduces nationality to economic relations, and treats national relations as a social force of no great significance.

Masaryk's distortions of the Marxist theory of proletarian internationalism were aimed at disarming the working people and keeping them in the captivity of bourgeois ideology.

Masaryk's own views on the national question were far from the ideas of genuine national liberation. When his country was still part of Austria-Hungary, he never suggested that the Czechs and Slovaks should pull out; on the contrary, he was for a stronger Austria-Hungary, for Austria playing the outstanding, and as far as possible the leading, role. His maximum demands before the war were for the preservation of Austria-Hungary and the establishment of some kind of Czech federation within the Austrian empire under the leadership of Franz Joseph. This demand was not to the slightest degree in accord with the interests of the Czechoslovak people.

With an eye to the interests of the exploiter classes, Masaryk also gave a distorted presentation of Marxist views on various forms of social consciousness and on various spheres of cultural activity.

He distorted, among other things, the materialist Marxist understanding of art, asserting, for example, that "art in the philosophy of Marx and Engels hardly plays any role at all",¹ and that because Marxism does not explain the social significance of art, he, Masaryk himself, had to investigate the connection between socialism and art. He said that as long as the proletariat concentrated its efforts on politics and the organisation of the masses, it had no time or energy left for art. But, Masaryk wrote, "art, just as philosophy, is seeking a new synthesis".² He was trying to

¹ Masaryk, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 241.

² *Ibid.*, p. 246.

convince the Czechs that the new art would not accept materialism and that materialism had met its downfall in art.¹

He accused Marxists of relegating art to oblivion, including painting, architecture and sculpture. He argued that the bourgeoisie accepted everything that was being done by the Socialists and, besides, it did not cast aside art, whereas Marxists took everything too materialistically and looked upon ideology, as well as art and beauty, with disdain.²

Masaryk could see how many Czechoslovak writers, artists and others in the arts and sciences were going over to socialist themes. Art—including literature, the theatre, architecture and painting—was moving closer to the interests of the popular masses. Consequently, Masaryk urged the bourgeoisie to play a leading role in culture, art and science and not to lose its influence on the intelligentsia. He felt that some modern artists and writers were gravitating towards socialism only out of their resentment towards the old regime.³

He also suggested that the bourgeoisie use a more cautious and thoughtful approach towards people in the fields of culture and science, i.e., towards the intelligentsia. He realised that the development of capitalism was bound to have an unfavourable influence on art and literature, while socialism opened up a new road for the best people in those fields. This does not mean that Masaryk wanted to lead them towards socialism; he was simply warning the bourgeoisie not to let the intelligentsia out of its hands so that it would not set off in a socialist direction.

It should be noted that Masaryk, who was a Czech by nationality but brought up in a German environment, looked with disdain upon Czech cultural and national traditions and everything nationally Czech. The Czech bourgeoisie did not approve of this, but it regarded his cosmopolitanism with favour and willingly spread the cult of Masaryk.

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., p. 251.

³ Ibid.

CHAPTER 4

MASARYKISM, THE OFFICIAL IDEOLOGY OF BOURGEOIS CZECHOSLOVAKIA

After Czechoslovakia gained independence in 1918, Masarykism became the official state ideology of bourgeois Czechoslovakia. But, as noted earlier, Masarykism was the ideology of the bourgeoisie in the period of imperialism and was consequently a reactionary ideology.

Prior to the establishment of an independent Czechoslovak state, the Czech bourgeoisie had been exceedingly timid, so much so that it never dared, even through its ideologists, to speak out boldly in favour of an independent Czech state when the Hapsburg monarchy was crumbling or even when Czechoslovakia was formed in 1918. It manoeuvred for a spot within the Austro-Hungarian state; it asked for Czech autonomy within the framework of the Hapsburg empire. The most that the Czech bourgeoisie hoped for was the possibility of placing a scion of the Russian or English royal family on the Czech throne. With these aspirations the bourgeoisie could not expect support from the popular masses. The vital interests of the Czech bourgeoisie, closely linked with German and Austro-Hungarian capital, sharply diverged from the interests of the exploited masses. For this reason, many Czech bourgeois figures embraced Masarykism and took a most active part in camouflaging the bourgeois class essence of Masaryk's philosophical and sociological views. They referred to Masaryk as a "genuine" humanist, a "democrat", a "friend of the people", and the champion and

ideologist of the Czech nation. In reality, however, Masaryk pursued an anti-worker policy. Before the emergence of the Czechoslovak state, the Czech bourgeoisie sought to portray Masaryk as the "friend of the people", a democrat and the champion of equality among nations. The appearance of Masaryk's book *The Social Question* showed that the Czech bourgeoisie, fearing the increasing gravitation of the popular masses towards Marxism, demanded that its ideologists emasculate the revolutionary content of that teaching and thereby deprive the working people of a powerful ideological weapon.

Masaryk's attempts through falsification to impede the penetration of Marxism into Czechoslovakia failed. After the founding of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and its acceptance into the Communist International in 1921, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism began to spread rapidly, and Masarykism, though predominant at the time, was unable to stop them. Masaryk became the spokesman for the reformist understanding of "socialism". But his "socialism" was doomed, and the decisive role in this was played by the CPCz. The entire history of the CPCz has been one of active struggle for the triumph of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism in Czechoslovakia.

Hoping to consolidate its class dominance, the Czech bourgeoisie linked the beginning of the national liberation movement with the emergence of the "Mafie" society, headed by Tomáš Masaryk and Eduard Beneš. These bourgeois ideologists and politicians attacked the theory of Marxism and the idea of class struggle, while advancing their own idea of national unity. Analysing the international situation in Europe and the possible results of a world war, Masaryk decided on active resistance to Austria only when he was sure that the Allies would win.¹

He feared that revolution might occur in Czechoslovakia

¹ See Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce 1914-1918. Uzpomíná a uvažuje T. G. Masaryk*, Praha, 1925, p. 37.

and considered the call for independence to be premature. He was apprehensive of revolution in Russia because it might strengthen the working class of Czechoslovakia. He put his stakes on imperialist war and considered the war of 1914 a convenient time for nationalistic work. Later, he and Beneš wrote memoirs in which they presented their views on the emergence of the Czechoslovak state and on its foreign policy. Since they represented the bourgeoisie, they had not raised the national question prior to the First World War; it was only towards the end of the war that they became spokesmen for bourgeois nationalism. At first they did not want Bohemia separated from Austria-Hungary; later, Masaryk described in his memoirs, entitled *World Revolution*, the history and evolution of his viewpoint on the organisation of an independent national Czech state. In the autumn of 1914, Masaryk and Beneš organised the Czech "Mafie" society abroad, and in 1915, the émigré Czech Action Committee, which united emigrant groups of Czechs and Slovaks abroad. Masaryk wrote that his own and the Committee's basic task was the separation of Bohemia and Slovakia from the Austro-Hungarian Empire as a result of the imperialist war. In 1916, the emigrant Czechs were joined by a group of emigrant Slovaks, the one headed by M. Štefaník, a former French officer. The Committee expanded its political work abroad. It received money from the United States.

Independent Czechoslovakia's first Constitution, adopted in 1918, confirmed the bourgeois nature of the Czech state. Reforms carried out by the bourgeoisie consolidated its dominance and created conditions for the capitalist development of the country.

Czechoslovakia was an industrial country from the outset, with a predominance of industry over agriculture and a large working class.

The task facing the proletariat after Czechoslovakia became independent was to combat bourgeois nationalism. This struggle did not develop immediately, however; it was

impeded to a large extent by Masarykism, which propagandised the illusion of national peace and co-operation between classes. And it was Masarykism that the Czech bourgeoisie surrounded with the halo of a "national" philosophy.

In the situation that developed after the First World War, the Czech bourgeoisie succeeded in making Masaryk the President of Czechoslovakia. Once in office, Masaryk defended the idea of Czechoslovakia becoming a bourgeois republic, the prototype of which he saw in the United States. He stressed that he, personally, felt "sympathetic" towards the American culture and that the Czech state could resemble America in that the Czechs had no dynasties, no nobility, no armies and no military tradition.¹ In 1918, Czechoslovakia was proclaimed a democratic republic.

The Czechoslovak bourgeoisie was highly interested in propagating the legend of Woodrow Wilson's special role in the creation of Czechoslovakia. This fact was fully substantiated and documented in a book by Jiří S. Hájek entitled *The Wilson Legend in the History of the Czechoslovak Republic*, published in 1953 by the Czechoslovak State Publishing House of Political Literature. Hájek showed that in the pre-Munich republic the Czech bourgeoisie had falsified the history of the emergence of the Czechoslovak state by portraying the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, as a great democrat and unselfish liberator of Czechoslovakia. All this was done with the aim of strengthening the positions of the bourgeoisie.

The first bourgeois coalition government in 1918 was composed of members of the Agrarian (Republican), Social-Democratic and National Socialist parties of Czechoslovakia. This government was guided by President Masaryk.

Masaryk led the struggle of the Czech bourgeoisie against the proletariat. The theory of the gradual development of

¹ See Zdeněk Šolle, "The Influence of Masarykism on the Czech Labour Movement in the Late 19th Century", *Nová mysl*, No. 3, 1954, pp. 286-301.

Czechoslovakia towards "socialism", which was advanced by the Right-wing Social-Democrats, was prompted by Masaryk. He had a great deal of experience in distorting Marxism, and he used this experience to supply the leaders of the Right-wing Social-Democrats with revisionist "arguments" against the revolutionary theoretical propositions of Marxism. In effect, Masaryk controlled the theoretical, ideological and practical activity of Czech Social-Democrats through the leader of their Right wing, Prime Minister Tusar, and directed this activity towards strengthening the positions of the bourgeoisie. Thus Masarykism became the official ideology and philosophy in Czechoslovakia. This meant that Social-Democracy had rejected socialist ideology and had gone over to the ideology of the bourgeoisie, to the betrayal of the working-class cause. This, in turn, meant that one of the tasks then facing the Communist Party was that of fighting and crushing Masarykism. As early as in 1928, for example, Klement Gottwald stressed the need to fight against "Masarykist humanism".¹ The negative effect that Masarykist "humanism" was having on the revolutionary ripening of the working class and intelligentsia required the mobilisation of the CPCz for the fight against Masarykism.

Bourgeois Czechoslovak historians created a legend in which Masaryk was portrayed as a humanist and statesman who was independent of the monopolies and stood above parties and the parliamentary struggle. After electing him President of the republic, the bourgeoisie created a cult of the individual around him, exaggerating his popularity among the people and hailing him as the protector of the people's interests, as the "arouser", the "enlightener" and the "father" of the republic.

The Czechoslovak working class was one of the most organised in Europe, and this was due in good measure to the work of the CPCz, which brought the theory of scientific socialism to the workers' movement and educated the work-

¹ Kl. Gottwald, *Spisy*, Vol. I, Praha, 1953, p. 133.

ing class in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, thus helping to raise its political prestige and its level of ideological development. The actions taken by the proletariat often influenced the decisions of the government of pre-Munich Czechoslovakia on domestic and foreign policy issues. Feeling this influence and realising that it was directed against the interests of the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie, the ruling circles of the country and their ideologists sought to spread various forms of bourgeois ideology within the workers' movement, hoping thereby to split it and weaken its influence in the political life of the country. It was for this purpose that the imperialist bourgeoisie made use of the demagogic "democratic" philosophy of Masaryk and Beneš. Masaryk's and Beneš's views and policy, however, were profoundly hostile to the proletariat, as are any ideology and policy of the bourgeoisie in the period of imperialism.

Underlying Beneš's and Masaryk's policy was their reformism. Beneš's philosophical views coincided with Masaryk's reformism. Beneš never published any independent philosophical works; everything philosophical and theoretical of his was taken from Masarykism. However, some of the opinions he expressed are of interest here. For example, in a pamphlet entitled *The Difficulties of Democracy*¹—which was primarily a brief presentation of the reformist "philosophy of modern democracy"—he asserted that it was the "philosophy of democracy" that lay at the basis of an understanding of the human essence.

The "philosophy of democracy", according to Beneš, was founded by the outstanding creators of the new philosophy, history and politics: Hobbes, Locke, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Voltaire, the Encyclopedists, Hume, Kant, Lessing, Herder, Mill. Some of the continuators of the French Revolution of 1848 and the entire school of modern socialism, according to Beneš, were directly related to this philosophy.

¹ See E. Beneš, *The Difficulties of Democracy. Speeches and Articles*, Prague, 1925, p. 54. (Authorised translation from the Czech by N. F. Melnikova-Papoushek.)

Beneš felt that the division of people into castes, estates, into the lower and the higher, had given way in the new era to the principle of human equality; everything was now judged according to one characteristic—"man". He said that the concept "man", together with the concept "God", was the most valuable that the world had had and could have. He named Hume, the Encyclopedists, Lessing and Herder as the founders of this concept. He also held that the concept "man" could be the only goal of all social activity.

Needless to say, Beneš's assertion was demagogic and groundless. A person's life and status are determined by his social and economic position, his belonging to one or another class in a capitalist society. Therefore, all talk about some kind of a single concept of "man" in an exploitative class society is designed to obscure the social and economic inequality of people under capitalism.

Beneš's sermons were a typical example of individualistic bourgeois philosophy, aimed above all at protecting private capitalist property. In reality, however, it is the very existence of private property that makes it impossible to speak of a single concept "man", for private property is the very basis of the *class stratification* of people in an exploitative society, including a capitalist society, into *antagonistic classes*.

Beneš did not restrict himself to just this definition of the concept "man", the essence of which he saw in the moral factor and not in the totality of social relations. He pointed out, further, that the idea of equality alone does not reveal the full substance of the concept "man". It requires the addition of the idea of "fraternity", which has both a social and a moral significance, for it supplements the idea of equality with the idea of "loving thy neighbour". These two ideas together make up the theoretical concept of humaneness, and it is the concept of humaneness that is contained in the philosophy of democracy.¹

As for the idea of freedom, Beneš held that it followed

¹ See E. Beneš, op. cit., pp. 55-56.

from the above-indicated philosophical principles. In answer to the question "What is freedom?", Beneš said that freedom was law, and that the concept of equality presupposed an equal degree of freedom for all.¹

The statement that *freedom is law* represents the typical bourgeois *formally juridical* understanding of freedom. Beneš's juridical concept of freedom, therefore, turns out, as in any bourgeois society, to be *formal* for the working people, and actual only for the ruling classes.

It follows from everything that Beneš said that his world outlook was an idealist one. Although he rarely mentioned Masaryk as the source of his own philosophical conclusions, there is no question that his views mirrored those of Masaryk's.

Reformist Beneš resolved the entire "philosophy" of democracy into equality, fraternity and liberty, that is, bourgeois-democratic freedoms based on the concept of "humanness". He declared democracy to be a non-class, apolitical phenomenon,² which, as it develops, tends to become broader and deeper, testifying to the fact that it is inherent in the human spirit. Reflection, criticism, debate and the clash of ideas all contribute to the fact that the human spirit stops at nothing.³ And Beneš drew the conclusion that in view of the fact that great *masses* served in modern armies and that "the whole nation" took part in war, "*war is becoming democratised*".⁴

Beneš's propositions regarding war lay bare *the inhumaneness* of the "humanism" in his philosophy. Instead of opposing wars, he went as far as recognising war as a democratic institution. Instead of concluding that because of the very *mass nature* of modern armies *war itself was inadmissible*, being a means of *destroying great masses of people*, he ended up asserting that "war is becoming democratised",

¹ Ibid., p. 56.

² Ibid., p. 63.

³ Ibid., p. 64.

⁴ Ibid., p. 66.

that it requires a conscientious soldier who is convinced of the "rightness" of war. The whole course of historical development shows that such views are dangerous and inhumane.

Having reached the point of maintaining that democracy seeps through into the army and *democratises war*, Beneš went on to voice a reactionary point of view in regard to other problems of social development. For example, he rejected the idea of classes and class struggle in society. His opinion was that class struggle was "not a democratic idea" because it was the antithesis of the idea of "humaneness". The class struggle idea inevitably leads to a materialist philosophy, while "humanism" basically presupposes a non-materialist philosophy.¹

The hypocrisy of Beneš's philosophical views can be seen from the fact that he posited the "democratisation of war", while at the same time opposing the class struggle. In so doing, he was trying to deprive the working people of the right to struggle for the improvement of their situation, their right to struggle for the establishment of a system that would lead to the elimination of all classes and, consequently, to the elimination of the class struggle and, along with it, the elimination of war itself in international relations.

Real humanism in a *class* society does not consist in rejecting the *class* struggle therein; it consists in eliminating private capitalist property, the basis of the class stratification of people, and in establishing a social system which would lead to the elimination of *class division* and of classes. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that real humanism consists in recognising the existence of classes and the class struggle as phenomena of capitalist reality, and in extending this recognition up to a socialist revolution, which, by eliminating private property, establishes the *basis* for abolishing the class division of people as well.

Beneš's opposition to *materialism* as allegedly irreconcilable with the ideas of humanism was also, in fact, opposition

¹ See E. Beneš, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

to genuine humanism. It is *materialism* that demands the creation of really *humane material* conditions of life for people, and it is materialism that pursues the goal of establishing the *same economic basis* of human equality for all and of eliminating the exploitation of man by man, creating thereby the basis for genuine equality among people in their spiritual development.

Beneš did not deny that modern society was capitalistic, but he maintained that democracy penetrated capital too. The reason for this was that capital had supposedly already realised that it could not retain its domination without democracy. "Therefore, capitalism and the employer himself have now already fallen under the general influence of political democratisation."¹

These assertions are as demagogic as the previous ones. Instead of raising the question of doing away with capital as soon as he got on to the subject of democracy, Beneš characterised capital as being democratic.

In setting forth his philosophical ideas about method in politics, Beneš said that the democratic political method developed along two lines: a) inductively and realistically; b) in the direction of "honest guidance" by the principles of truth.² These principles of method in politics characterise the idealist foundation of Beneš's views and are in their essence unscientific. Beneš needed such arguments, however, in order to substantiate the necessity for a bourgeois-democratic form of government and to cover up the actual imperialist essence of the rule of capital in Czechoslovakia.

Beneš regarded the role of parliament from the standpoint of his "democratic" philosophy, putting in the forefront the problem of "government and state authority in democracy". He felt that just as military discipline and dictatorship are natural phenomena in time of war³—for battles cannot be

¹ Ibid., p. 72.

² Ibid., p. 77.

³ Ibid., p. 79.

postponed pending democratic debate—so is it perfectly natural for leadership in parliament to pass into the hands of a few individuals, since most of the deputies have absolutely no idea of what is being done or what must be done in the state. It turns out, in practice, that there can be no such thing as pure democracy in parliament.¹

Beneš tried to mitigate the discrepancy between this state of affairs and the picture of bourgeois democracy and “humanism” which he himself had painted, by saying that the Czechoslovaks were living in a period in which a monarchical and aristocratic society was being converted into a democratic one; hence democracy itself was in a state of transition as one society was being abandoned and the other not yet attained.²

Using his philosophical views as a starting point, Beneš proceeded to defend the dominance of the bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia by denying the existence of class struggle in the country and urging the consolidation of bourgeois parliamentarism. On the basis of his philosophical premise that *capitalism and wars were becoming democratised*, he argued that it was senseless for the working class to rise up against capital, for that would be “undemocratic”. He defended the proposition that private property is eternal, and he rejected the idea of revolution. Beneš condemned the October Revolution in Russia; he considered the proletarian victory a distortion of democracy and categorised it as ultra-democracy. His conclusion was that historical materialism and the principles of class struggle contradict “democratic” philosophy³ and that the principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat conflict with the ideas of democracy. The method of democracy is evolutionary; democracy has never defended revolution.⁴ Such democracy is “anthropocracy”, to use Masaryk’s expression; it is humane. It is so democratic that it can

¹ See E. Beneš, op. cit., p. 82.

² Ibid., p. 88.

³ Ibid., p. 103.

⁴ Ibid., p. 108.

justify and protect the existence of a small people and state.¹

By politics Beneš understood the activity of leaders among the masses.²

In regard to international relations and international organisations, although Beneš recognised many shortcomings in the League of Nations, he nonetheless justified them. For example, he recognised that there could be no question of complete sovereignty for the separate states in the League of Nations. Insofar as there was no perfect democracy in the internal policies of individual states, there was even less perfect democracy in their international relations.

Beneš, like Masaryk, was an ardent foe of Marxist-Leninist science. The following fact bears this out. In a talk with the director of the Prague branch of the France Press News Agency³ he said that idealism and materialism were two trends in philosophy (Beneš said metaphysics) that had been struggling one against the other for ages. However, neither of the two trends could win out because in this case it was a matter of an eternal struggle of human generations. Beneš himself adhered to the idealist trend and considered it wrong to link socialist conceptions with any kind of materialism. In his opinion, socialism was above all a way of thinking rather than a philosophical trend, and hence anyone could be an idealist or a materialist without it interfering with his thinking "socialistically". Christian "socialism" allegedly served as proof of this.

Further, Beneš stated that there were practical reasons prompting him to undertake certain "socialistic" measures in Czechoslovakia, as, for example, the nationalisation of mines and natural resources. As these measures were being implemented, however, he acted to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie; he strove to keep nationalisation to a minimum,

¹ Ibid., p. 109.

² Ibid., p. 111.

³ See *Právo lidu*, December 23, 1945.

as the English were doing and as the Czech bourgeoisie did in 1920. The revolutionary movement of the Czechoslovak people forced him to camouflage his bourgeois views with slogans advocating "gradual nationalisation" implemented "stage by stage". Beneš maintained that it was necessary to implement measures leading to "socialism" gradually, thus avoiding a violent transition from one system to the other. To accomplish this there was no need, in his opinion, for a dictatorship of the proletariat. He argued that the history of mankind had already reached a point where Marxism could be considered obsolete.

The facts of history, including the victory of the people's democratic system in Czechoslovakia, tell a different story: the views of Eduard Beneš have become antiquated and have receded into the past, while Marxism-Leninism continues to score victory after victory. Of historic significance has been the emergence of the world socialist system and the continued deepening of the world revolutionary process.

CHAPTER 5

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA IN THE STRUGGLE FOR THE VICTORY OF MARXISM-LENINISM, THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM AND SOCIALISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

1. THE EMERGENCE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA. THE CPCz'S STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALIST POLICY AND IDEOLOGY

The Formation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia

The history of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is the history of its struggle against opportunism and reformism, of its struggle to establish itself as a party of a new type and to secure the triumph of Marxism-Leninism in Czechoslovakia.

From the beginning of the 20th century, Czech Social-Democracy followed a revisionist political line. Having gone over completely to positions of opportunism and reformism, the leadership of the party did not pursue an independent policy but simply trailed along behind the Czech bourgeoisie. Social-Democratic leaders advocated co-operation with the bourgeoisie and zealously carried out its will.

During the First World War, the Rightist leaders of the Social-Democratic Party openly betrayed the interests of the proletariat and became bourgeois agents in the ranks of the working class. As a consequence, this party could not adopt a policy of direct struggle with the bourgeoisie and supported the imperialist war. As was the case with all Social-Democratic parties of that time, it was capable of parliamentary struggle within the framework of a bourgeois system, but was unfit for revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie and for the establishment of proletarian dictatorship. With the exception of only a few progressives, the leaders of Czech Social-Democracy (Tusar, Bechyně, Soukup, Habrman, Modráček, Hampl) were opportunists closely linked with the bour-

geoisie. Evidence of this was their reaction to the December 1920 strike: they not only refused to support the strike, but actually became accomplices in the bloody reprisals against the workers.

A powerful wave of revolutionary fervour had swept the country after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia and as a result of an upsurge of the national liberation struggle of the Czechs and Slovaks. The strength and influence of the working class had grown immeasurably, and the Social-Democratic Party, from which the working people had expected a policy defending their interests, had become much stronger than all the other parties in the country. But what did its Rightist leaders, advocates of evolutionary socialism, do under such favourable conditions? They not only condoned the bloody actions taken against striking workers, but were themselves directly involved in organising them, as the history of the general strike of 1920 has shown.¹ The opportunist Social-Democratic leadership was mortally afraid of the revolutionary actions being taken by the workers.

As a result of the Social-Democratic Party's inability to lead the workers' movement, the party's so-called "Marxist Left" split away, to become, a year later, the nucleus of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. The Right wing agreed to the split when it saw that the "Marxist Left" had succeeded in winning over the majority of the politically organised workers to its side.

In May 1921, 655 delegates (86 of whom had the right of consultative vote), representing the Left wing of Czechoslovak Social-Democracy, convened in Prague as the founding congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

The keynote address at the Congress was delivered by Party leader Bohumír Šmeral. His address, subsequently published in the newspaper *Rudé právo* under the heading "We Are Communists!", covered questions of primary interest:

¹ See *Rudé právo*, March 7, 1956.

the international political crisis in Europe and the growth of revolutionary sentiments among the working people; the world economic crisis and the need to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat; the organisation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and its future growth and consolidation as a mass party.

Šmeral concluded his address with the following words: "We are more than a political party. We are the vanguard of a new life. By establishing new relations, we want also to create new people."

Unfortunately, Šmeral's speech contained an erroneous assessment of the sacrifices involved in conducting a revolution. Lenin drew attention to this error,¹ and Šmeral subsequently corrected it.

The Congress also discussed problems connected with the Party's organisational and ideological propaganda, the forms of modern capitalism, the growth and organisation of the revolutionary forces among the working people, and the attitude of the Communist Party to the trade unions. The CPCz clarified its position in relation to the various classes and social strata in the country, i.e., the poor, the middle strata and the intelligentsia.

Other questions discussed were: the current world political situation; the situation in Czechoslovakia and the tasks of the CPCz; the work of the Communist International; the work of the CPCz in the trade unions; democratic centralism and Party discipline.

The founding congress resolved that the Left wing of the Social-Democratic Party would henceforth be called the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and that the CPCz should unconditionally join the Third International. The delegates agreed to fulfil the responsibilities set forth in the 21 conditions of the Communist International, not only during the temporary lull in the struggle, but also during sharp class struggle and open clashes with capitalism.

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 488.

The Congress culminated in the adoption of the Party Programme and Party Rules and the election of a Central Committee.

Thus, in 1921, the revolutionary segment of the working class, inspired by the Great October Socialist Revolution and using the historic experience of the CPSU, established the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. The CPCz became tempered in fierce class struggle and developed into a Leninist Party, a party of a new type, capable of preparing for, and organising and leading revolutionary struggle.

Of great significance for the CPCz was the Third Congress of the Comintern held in June and July of 1921. At that Congress, Lenin spoke on the CPCz's organisational tactics and specifically against Terracini's objections to the contemplated mass nature of the CPCz. Terracini had raised objections to the Comintern's position, as set forth in its Theses, that while the Party already had from 300,000 to 400,000 members, it was necessary to continue drawing in ever greater numbers from among the working people. Terracini cited the fact that the Communists in Russia had won out even though their Party was very small. In his opinion, if the CPCz already had 400,000 members, why did it need more?

Lenin pointed out that anyone who did not understand that in Europe, where the proletariat was organised, Communists must win over the majority of the working class, is lost to the communist movement. He said that Terracini evidently did not understand much in the Russian revolution. True, the Communists were a small party in Russia, but most of the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies throughout the country were solidly behind them, as was nearly half the army, which then numbered at least ten million men.¹

The Comintern, taking into account the conditions prevailing in Czechoslovakia, considered the CPCz's struggle to become a mass party to be necessary and correct.

At the Third Congress the CPCz was admitted to the

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 471.

Third International with the recommendation that it organise, as soon as possible, a single Communist Party representing the working class of all nations and nationalities in the country.

The formation of the CPCz was an historic victory for the working class of Czechoslovakia. It took place at a time when, as Lenin pointed out, the proletariat of the advanced capitalist countries everywhere were moving their Communist parties into the foreground.

The correlation of class forces in the international arena had shifted in a direction unfavourable to the bourgeoisie as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. There were now two worlds, two systems. "The international bourgeoisie," Lenin wrote, "deprived of the opportunity of waging open war against Soviet Russia, is waiting and watching for the moment when circumstances will permit it to resume the war."¹ This tactic of "waiting and watching" for the opportune moment for war against the Soviet state also suited the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie. Under the circumstances, it was extremely urgent to unite the actions of all nations and nationalities of Czechoslovakia and to establish a single Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

A joint conference of Czechoslovak communist organisations was held on August 27, 1921, and the decision was taken to convene a unity congress in October of that same year.

The unity congress of the CPCz was held in October-November 1921, in Prague.² Its agenda included the following questions: unification of all the national sections of the Communist Party in Bohemia, Slovakia and the Sudetenland; the Party Rules; the Party Programme; the economic and political situation. Delegates also heard a "Report on the Third Congress of the Comintern" and a "Letter from the Third Communist International on Organisational Rules".

¹ Ibid., p. 454.

² See J. Veselý, *O vzniku a založení KSČ*, Praha, 1953, pp. 147-61.

In a monograph by J. Veselý, the results of this congress were assessed as follows:

"The unification of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia became a powerful manifestation of proletarian internationalism.

"The internationally unified revolutionary party of the proletariat of Czechoslovakia became a bastion, an impenetrable fortress of the working class in all of its subsequent battles. Its unconquerable strength lay not only in its hundreds of thousands of members, but also in the fact that it had an army of supporters numbering almost a million people, who throughout the years of the pre-Munich republic and after it remained loyal to the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. They were with it in good and in difficult times and helped it to avoid the traps laid by the bourgeoisie in its attempts to demoralise, break up and destroy this militant vanguard of the working class by use of violence, repression and threats to suppress the Party.

"This is why the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie was never able to defeat the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Even the nazi terror, the bloody six-year rampage of Hitler's executioners, was unable to break the strength of the Communist Party and its close ties with the broad masses of working people.

"In this respect, the unity congress had fulfilled its task with honour."¹ Thus, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the militant headquarters of the proletariat, was founded at the unity congress.

The Central Committee of the CPCz presented to the unity congress a report analysing the current situation and continuing aggravation of the crisis of capitalism and reviewing the situation in the country.

The congress adopted resolutions on all reports heard. The resolution on the first agenda question stated that the representatives of the Czechoslovak proletariat, having gathered

¹ J. Veselý, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

in a general unity congress, greeted the resolution of the Third Communist International regarding the establishment of a single international Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

In accordance with the decisions of the Comintern, the CPCz inaugurated an extensive programme of work within the working class of the country. The Party's policy and tasks were based on the clear-cut Marxist-Leninist principles outlined in the congress resolutions. As noted in those resolutions, the Party stood on the platform of the Third International.

After 1921, the CPCz became extremely active in Parliament and in various mass organisations, defending the interests of the working class against the capitalists and helping the peasantry in its struggle for the implementation of the anti-feudal agrarian reform of 1919.

Inner-Party Struggle and the Transformation of the CPCz into a Marxist-Leninist Party

The CPCz held its Second Congress in 1924, in Prague. The mood at the Congress was seriously affected by the defeat suffered by the German proletariat in October 1923. The situation was such that opportunist elements and Social-Democratic relapses due to the presence within the Party of former Social-Democrats gave rise to a serious Right-wing danger and tendencies towards opportunism within the young party. The defeat of the revolution in Germany only worsened the situation in the Party. Complicating the situation further was the formation of a petty-bourgeois group around Jílek, an advocate of an anarcho-syndicalist orientation.

Differences within the Party were discussed in March 1925 at a meeting of the Czechoslovak Commission of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (ECCI), the former having been set up at the fifth enlarged plenary session of the ECCI. Help was forthcoming. In his work *The Founding of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia*, Jindřich Veselý stressed the enormous significance of the assistance

rendered by Lenin, the CPSU(B) and the Communist International to the CPCz at the time it was being formed and turned into a Marxist-Leninist Party. "The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia," he wrote, "gained a great deal not only because it joined the Communist International, but above all because its leaders, in particular Bohumir Šmeral and Antonín Zápotocký, became personally acquainted with the ideas and principles of Marxism-Leninism and with the results of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia. They had the opportunity of speaking and consulting with the great Lenin and of discussing with him the problems of the Czechoslovak revolutionary movement. . . .

"Lenin devoted a great deal of attention to the problems of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. . . . This was primarily because the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia played an important role, since it was an especially large party functioning in a country situated in the centre of Europe, a country highly developed industrially, with 73 per cent of the industry of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire concentrated on its territory, and a country with an army of almost three million workers."¹

Prior to its Fifth Congress (1929), the CPCz went through a complicated period of inner-Party struggle. The Party faced an ever growing threat from the Right as a reflection of the conditions of the class struggle in the country and the influence of bourgeois ideology on the working class. Agents of the bourgeoisie and reformist agitators were infiltrating the Party and the workers' movement. By 1925, the need had ripened for the Communists to take serious action to counter the growing opportunist tendencies. In March 1925, representative of the USSR J. V. Stalin, on the instruction of the CPSU(B) delegation, delivered a speech "On the Czechoslovak Communist Party" at a sitting of the Czechoslovak Commission of the ECCI. In it he made a Marxist analysis of the situation in the CPCz and outlined what had to be

¹ J. Veselý, *op. cit.*, pp. 164-65.

done to resolve the contradictions that had arisen. Later, the 14th Congress of the CPSU(B) resolved, after discussing the CPSU(B) delegation's report to the ECCI, that "the CPSU(B) delegation helped a number of parties (Czechoslovak, German, Polish, etc.) to overcome dangerous deviations under the conditions of the partial stabilisation of capitalism in the West".¹

The ECCI at its plenary session noted that the crisis in the CPCz stemmed basically from the difficulties that had arisen in connection with the transition from a period of revolutionary upsurge to a period of relative calm.

The CPCz was threatened from both the Left and the Right, but the greater danger was from the Right for three basic reasons.

Firstly, there was a lull in the revolutionary struggle of the Czechoslovak working class, and this gave rise to Social-Democratic and reformist illusions. In general, the Leftist danger becomes basic during periods of revolutionary upsurge, whereas in periods of calm, when compromise illusions grow, the danger from the Right becomes basic.

Secondly, no less than 70 per cent of the CPCz members were former Social-Democrats, which made possible Social-Democratic relapses and increased the danger from the Right.

Thirdly, the Party was also divided along national lines: the Czechs, who represented the dominating nation in the independent Czechoslovak state formed in 1918, wound up on the Right flank, while the oppressed nationalities were on the Left.

On the other hand, underestimation of the importance of parliamentary activity and of trade union work engendered danger from the Left, leading to alienation from the masses and sectarianism.

¹ *The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee Plenary Meetings, Part II, Moscow, 1954, p. 210 (in Russian).*

The CC CPCz aimed its criticism only against the Leftists, erroneously supposing that this was the source of the main danger.

Alongside its positive features (close links with the masses, the growth of the Party's prestige in the society), the mass character of the CPCz also had certain negative features (difficulties in the struggle with Social-Democratic traditions and opportunist tendencies).

Under the influence of these difficulties, a careless attitude took root in the CPCz towards problems of ideological struggle and various kinds of deviation from revolutionary Marxism. A "good-natured, sentimental attitude, as if they were some kind of ideological mischief"¹ prevailed with regard to the latter.

A conciliatory attitude to hostile ideology and to hostile trends within the Party ran counter to the Leninist principles of creating a party of a new type and led to the growth of crisis tendencies in the development of the CPCz during that period.

It was in March 1925 that the plenary session of the ECCI played its part in overcoming the danger of a split in the CPCz. But the situation within the country was complex. The parliamentary elections in November 1925 revealed the bankruptcy of the forces which had counted on reinforcing the domination of the capitalists in Czechoslovakia by playing on national sentiments. Prior to 1925, the Czech bourgeoisie, with the help of the Social-Democrats, had held the dominating positions and a political monopoly in the state. The bourgeoisie of the national minorities was kept out of the government. The 1925 elections made it clear, however, that the Social-Democrats in the government had actually already lost their influence with the proletariat.

The Communist Party succeeded at that time in unfolding such a broad and powerful movement among the working

¹ See D. Manuilsky, "The Czech Example—a Lesson for the Entire Comintern", *Communist International*, No. 6, 1925, pp. 19-20 (in Russian).

people that the bourgeoisie lost its zeal for a fascist or military coup. Instead, it agreed to the formation of Švehla's multi-national government. The policy of that government led to an aggravation of the class struggle in the country and a new revolutionary upsurge. Under these conditions, the failure of the CPCz to adhere to the Leninist tactic of irreconcilable struggle against the Rightists in itself became a tactic for saving the Rightists and deepening the crisis.

To prevent this it was imperative that the CPCz resolutely and consistently apply the Leninist tactic of merciless struggle against the Right-wing groups within the communist movement.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union helped to clarify the causes of the crisis in the CPCz in 1925 and to outline the ways and means of overcoming it. The basic task of the CPCz was to combat the danger from the Right. It would be impossible for the CPCz to develop as a Marxist-Leninist Party unless the Right-wing groups were routed ideologically and morally and unless the entire rank-and-file membership of the Party became involved in the struggle.

The Czechoslovak Commission of the ECCI concluded that consolidation of the healthy revolutionary forces within the Party was the basic requirement for the elimination of the crisis, and this recommendation laid the groundwork for the victory of the Marxist-Leninist line at the Fifth Congress of the CPCz in 1929. It thus helped to forge the most essential weapon needed in the struggle for the people's freedom and the victory of socialism: it helped transform the CPCz into a party of a new, Leninist type.

Thus it was that in 1925 the ECCI and the CPSU(B) rendered substantial assistance to the CPCz in overcoming the growing possibility of a split caused by the conciliatory policy towards the Right wing.

By the time of the Third Congress of the CPCz in 1925, the way out of the crisis had been found. The Congress discussed the political and economic situation and the further tasks of the Communist Party. It reviewed the inner-Party

crisis and the ways towards its solution and considered questions of organisation. A resolution was adopted to further intensify the struggle to consolidate the Marxist-Leninist nature of the Party.

The Congress stated that the CPCz could not be an appendage of the parliamentary electoral mechanism, as was characteristic of Social-Democracy; it could not be a mere supplement to the trade unions, as was characteristic of anarcho-syndicalism. It had to be the highest form of the proletariat's class unity, and to guide all the other proletarian organisations, from the trade unions to the parliamentary faction.

The CPCz had to thoroughly master the revolutionary theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, and to issue its slogans and directives, not dogmatically or according to rote formulas and historical parallels, but on the basis of a careful analysis of the concrete historical conditions and objective regularities of the revolutionary movement in Czechoslovakia, with account taken of current internal and international conditions, and always with the experience of revolutions elsewhere kept in mind.

The Congress underlined that each step taken by the CPCz had to help the revolutionary masses prepare for a proletarian revolution.

According to the decisions of the Congress, it was incumbent upon the CPCz in the course of its work:

- not only to teach the masses, but to learn from them, to raise the level of consciousness of the masses, harken to the voice of the masses and fight for the satisfaction of their needs;

- to pursue an uncompromising, yet flexible, revolutionary policy. Otherwise, the Party would not be able to master all the forms of struggle and organisation, nor connect the day-to-day interests of the workers with the basic interests of the proletarian revolution;

- to be able to educate its cadres on the basis of its rich experience accumulated in the struggle against capitalism and lead them towards successful achievements;

— skilfully to select the best of its vanguard fighters for its basic, leading group—they must be fully devoted to be genuine spokesmen for the aspirations of the revolutionary proletariat, and sufficiently experienced to become actual leaders of the proletarian revolution and be capable of applying the strategy and tactics of Marxism-Leninism;

— systematically to improve the social structure of its organisations and rid its ranks of corrupting opportunist elements, achieving thereby maximum unity;

— to develop among the Party members strict proletarian discipline, ideological cohesion, a clear understanding of the goals of the movement, unity in practical activity and conscious involvement in the realisation of Party tasks;

— to check back systematically to see that its own decisions and directives are being carried out.

Such were the Marxist-Leninist principles on which the CPCz based its struggle to become a party of a new type.

In the course of its fight for Leninist principles, the Party formed a Marxist-Leninist Central Committee, headed by Klement Gottwald. The CPCz conducted a persistent struggle to enable the proletariat to nationalise the banks and expropriate the manufacturers and speculators, to enable the agricultural workers and land-starved peasants to expropriate the landowners, and to enable the oppressed peoples of Czechoslovakia to gain their freedom.

A split in the Party was prevented, conditions for effective struggle against the Rightists and the Leftists within the Party were created, and a programme for the future growth of the Party was formulated. The Party scored definite successes in rallying the proletarian masses and overcoming the crisis.

It was not long, however, before an anti-Party faction, headed by Jílek, Bolen and Nejrát, again took shape. In 1926, this group wormed its way into the Party leadership. The Jílekites undermined the efforts of the Party to consolidate itself as a new type of party: they approached all political issues from the standpoint of uninspired organisa-

tional practicality and attempted to alienate the Party from the working-class masses by harping on the passivity of the masses and the weakness of the Party apparatus. In fact, the Jílekites were pursuing a bourgeois policy within the workers' movement. The Jílek-Bolen group stood at the helm of the Party for two years (1926-1928) before its members were finally expelled in 1929. In those two years, however, the group caused considerable political damage to the CPCz. The emergence of such a group within the CPCz should be viewed as a penetration of bourgeois ideology into the communist movement of Czechoslovakia.

During this period, which was characterised by the partial stabilisation of capitalism, the bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia, besides mobilising all the organs of the state apparatus to fight the CPCz, used other means of exerting its influence. One of these was the above-mentioned Jílek-Bolen group which, in its effort to isolate the CPCz from the masses, succeeded in frustrating a number of workers' strikes and a campaign to improve workers' social insurance.

At the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, held in Moscow between July 17 and September 1, 1928, a special commission was formed to study the Czechoslovak question. The ECCI, in an open letter to the Communists of Czechoslovakia (Decision of the ECCI of September 3, 1928), denounced the views of the CPCz leadership. Meanwhile, Klement Gottwald published an article under the heading "Materials for the Discussion of the Czechoslovak Question",¹ in which he clarified the state of affairs within the Party.

Gottwald pointed out that the Party and all working people had suffered a serious setback during the Red Day working-class demonstration of July 6, 1928, which the CPCz had led to protest a government ban on the CPCz-sponsored Second Sports Tournament. Noting that this defeat was a consequence of errors and shortcomings in the activity of the CPCz, Gottwald pointed to the fact that it was imper-

¹ See Kl. Gottwald, *Spisy*, Vol. I, p. 101 *et seq.*

ative "to carefully examine the entire activity of the Party over the recent period ... to analyse the economic, political and social position of the Czechoslovak Republic, to assess the correlation and alignment of class forces, and to examine the political and tactical line of the Party".¹

Although most of the CPCz leaders adhered to the ECCI position in theory, they made definite opportunist errors when it came to applying the Comintern line to the concrete conditions in Czechoslovakia, and this accounted for the Right-wing deviation in the Party line. The result was that the inner-Party course pursued by the greater part of the Party's leadership was incorrect. It followed that further efforts were required to consolidate the Marxist-Leninist character of the Party. The leadership, as it stood at the time, hampered these efforts.

The Victory of Marxism-Leninism in the CPCz

The Fifth Congress of the CPCz, held in February 1929, occupies a special place in the history of the Party, for it was at this Congress that the CPCz scored a decisive victory over opportunism and established itself solidly as a *Marxist-Leninist Party*. The Congress gave the CPCz a clear general line, indicating the strategic goal of struggle to be the overthrow of the bourgeoisie's rule by revolutionary means and the establishment of working-class power. The Congress marked the beginning of a new period in the struggle of Czechoslovak working class for socialism. As Klement Gottwald put it, "the Fifth Congress of the CPCz is not the end, but, on the contrary, the beginning of struggle—the beginning of large and difficult battles yet awaiting us.... The Fifth Congress of the Communist Party has given the Party the correct ideological, political and organisational guidelines in this severe struggle."²

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., p. 229.

The Fifth Congress laid bare the chief causes of the crisis in the Party. As Gottwald pointed out in his report at the Congress, the CPCz was burdened with Social-Democratic vestiges to a greater extent than other sections of the Comintern; consequently, in order to resolve the crisis, in order to re-establish close ties with the masses of working people during that period of growing class contradictions when the masses were becoming increasingly revolutionary, it was first of all necessary to overcome reformist and Social-Democratic traditions. The triumph of Leninist principles and the Party's successful weathering of the crisis depended on tireless struggle against these traditions—struggle not only against their individual proponents, but primarily against the reformist ideology with which the Party had become infected.

The most dangerous group during that period was the Jílek faction, whose opportunism took the form of the theory of the alleged passivity of the masses. The ideological principles of this group were causing serious damage to the communist movement in Czechoslovakia. The opportunism of Jílek's group had to be routed if the CPCz was to move forward.

The Congress outlined the tasks of the Party for the immediate future. The most important of these was to fight against the danger of war, to which end the CPCz had to work towards unifying all segments of the working people for the struggle for peace and against attempts to bring about a fascist coup within the country. The Congress also set the task of improving the social structure of the Party. The chief Party task at that time, however, was to overcome and eliminate all opportunism and reformism within the Party.

The Congress defined the then Czechoslovak state as imperialist in essence and ascertained that the crisis within the Party stemmed primarily from still existing opportunist Social-Democratic traditions.

The Fifth Congress was an important landmark on the CPCz's road towards establishing itself ideologically and politically as a Marxist-Leninist Party.

The CPCz'S Struggle Against Masarykism and Social-Democratism

Masarykism and Social-Democratism were two mutually complementary forms of reactionary ideology prevailing in bourgeois Czechoslovakia; both served the interests of capitalism and both were directed against the workers' movement and against working-class unity.

From the moment of its inception, the CPCz conducted vigorous campaigns against these forms of bourgeois ideology as it spread the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and struggled against the existing capitalist system.

The working class and the Communist Party were opposed to the cult of Masaryk that had been fostered by the bourgeoisie ever since Czechoslovakia became an independent state. The CPCz made it clear to the working class that the creation of the Czechoslovak Republic was connected with the decisive impact made on the growth and successes of the national liberation movement by the Great October Socialist Revolution. The Czechoslovak working class took a negative view of the anti-Soviet policy pursued by the Czech bourgeoisie and of the counter-revolutionary role played by Masaryk during the revolt of a Czechoslovak corps in Russia in 1918.

The working class actually opposed Masarykism when it rose to an armed uprising in Prague in December 1920. The bloody reprisals that followed revealed the class hostility of Masarykism towards the proletariat and the irreconcilability of the class interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party always saw Masarykism as an ideology and policy of the bourgeoisie, and Masaryk himself as a political and ideological representative of finance capital, hostile to the Czechoslovak people.

When Masaryk became President, the Czech bourgeoisie inflated his popularity among the people as the "defender of the people's interests". Masaryk's "reforms", which the press portrayed as almost socialistic in nature, were designed

to deceive the working people. Masaryk received "gifts" running into the millions, and at the same time launched a campaign to reduce presidential office expenses, thus attracting part of the petty bourgeoisie and intelligentsia to his side.

Petty-bourgeois ideology and petty-bourgeois democracy were fairly widespread in Czechoslovakia. Right-wing Socialists, in explaining the nature of bourgeois democracy, tried to give the impression that the bourgeoisie had stopped resisting and was prepared to submit to the will of the majority of the people, that an era of "pure democracy" had arrived wherein the state was no longer necessary and labour was no longer suppressed by capital.¹ The classic description of this kind of "democratism" was given by Karl Marx, who wrote that "the democrat, because he represents the petty bourgeoisie, that is, a *transition class*, in which the interests of two classes are simultaneously mutually blunted, imagines himself elevated above class antagonism generally. The democrats concede that a privileged class confronts them, but they, along with all the rest of the nation, form the *people*. What they represent is the *people's rights*; what interests them is the *people's interests*. Accordingly, when a struggle is impending, they do not need to examine the interests and positions of the different classes. They do not need to weigh their own resources too critically. They have merely to give the signal and the *people*, with all its inexhaustible resources, will fall upon the *oppressors*. Now, if in the performance their interests prove to be uninteresting and their potency impotence, then either the fault lies with pernicious sophists, who split the *indivisible people* into different hostile camps, or the army was too brutalised and blinded to comprehend that the pure aims of democracy are

¹ Lenin described the real meaning of this kind of demagoguery about "pure democracy" as follows: "The idealised democratic republic of Wilson *proved* in practice to be a form of the most rabid imperialism, of the most shameless oppression and suppression of weak and small nations" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 189).

the best thing for it itself, or the whole thing has been wrecked by a detail in its execution, or else an unforeseen accident has this time spoilt the game."¹

This characterisation was fully applicable to the Czechoslovak bourgeois parties, and in particular to the National Socialist Party, which propagandised the idea of class collaboration, urging that the conflicting interests of the antagonistic classes be reconciled. It declared that it stood above the struggle between parties and that it expressed the interests of the people, thus passing off bourgeois interests as the people's interests. But whenever the workers turned to the leaders of that party for support, they found not even sympathy. The workers were told that the interests of the people were dear to the National Socialist Party. But it was, in fact, an anti-popular party. Whenever the working class staged demonstrations with revolutionary slogans and the Czechoslovak government ordered the demonstrations to be fired upon, the bourgeois parties remained silent. That was the way it was in 1920, and again in 1930, 1931 and 1932. The National Socialist Party was a typical bourgeois party in its class make-up and nature. It spread its influence on part of the proletariat through the trade unions, helping in this way to secure the dominance of monopoly capital.

Right Social-Democracy also preached the bourgeois ideology. It demanded democratic-republican institutions as a means, not of doing away with capital and wage labour, but of transforming the antagonism between the two into "harmony". Nothing that that party ever undertook jeopardised the bourgeois nature of the society. The goal of Social-Democrats was the transformation of society by "democratic" means, but always within the bounds of the bourgeois structure. The petty bourgeoisie does not feel, however, that it is struggling only for its own class interests. It believes that the social conditions of its emancipation are the general conditions within the framework of which society

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 426-27.

can be saved and the class struggle avoided. Not all of the Social-Democratic representatives are shopkeepers themselves. However, as Marx pointed out, "what makes them representatives of the petty bourgeoisie is the fact that in their minds they do not get beyond the limits which the latter do not get beyond in life, that they are consequently driven, theoretically, to the same problems and solutions to which material interest and social position drive the latter practically".¹

The revolutionary actions of the proletariat greatly influenced the conduct of the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie. The more the proletariat developed and began to see itself as a class, the more reactionary became the coalition bourgeois government and the more cowardly and insidious became the ideologists of Czech "democracy".

The imperialist bourgeoisie needed the myth about a "country of classic bourgeois democracy" to conceal its hostility to democracy, to cloud the consciousness of the working people and reinforce the ideas of liberalism. It pointed to Czechoslovakia as one such country. The bourgeoisie, especially in Czechoslovakia, extolled bourgeois freedoms and spoke in glowing terms of equality, fraternity and democracy. Characteristically, all the members of the Sokol organisation in Czechoslovakia referred to each other, and to their president as well, as "brother": it was as if everyone in the bourgeois republic was "equal" before the law. In the meantime, one bourgeois government after another fired into demonstrations of hungry workers, threw workers' representatives into prison and barred working-class youths from the Sokol sports organisations. The Communist Party confronted this morass, bringing the working class, the masses of working people, to realise the need for revolution and class struggle against capitalism.

All the above is indicative of the unseemly role that Masaryk and Beneš played in the history of Czechoslovakia.

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 424.

They were enemies of the Czechoslovak working people and champions of the imperialist policies of monopoly capital. They represented the monopoly bourgeoisie, and all their theoretical conclusions actually expressed the interests of that class.

Throughout its history, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has conducted an active struggle against the reactionary bourgeois ideology of Masaryk and Beneš, to which it counterposed the Marxist-Leninist ideology. It countered Masaryk's tactics of "democratic" demagoguery with the class struggle for a people's republic, for the victory of the working class and for socialism.

At the same time, the CPCz worked hard to expose the true nature of reformism—the ideology of Right Social-Democracy which was widespread in the country and was very closely linked with Masarykism. In his report to the Fifth Congress of the CPCz in 1929, Klement Gottwald pointed out that reformism was playing the role of a bourgeois agent in Czechoslovakia as well as elsewhere. The social causes of the growth of reformism were the relative stabilisation of capitalism and the fact that the bourgeoisie was using part of the profits it amassed through intensified exploitation of the working-class masses to bribe a narrow segment of the labour aristocracy which supplied members for Social-Democrats. In addition, the reformist parties were winning over increasing numbers of the petty bourgeoisie, whose political confusion was growing. Under the conditions of class stratification and a regrouping of class forces the objective of reformism was to split the unity of the proletariat and to pursue a policy of collaboration with the capitalists. Consequently, intensified struggle against reformism was highly essential.¹

By the time Czechoslovakia had become an independent republic, that is, by 1918, Right-wing Social-Democracy had already gone over to opportunist and reformist positions. It had not headed the movement of the Czechoslovak prole-

¹ See Kl. Gottwald, *Spisy*, Vol. I, pp. 203-04.

tariat demanding the formation of an independent Czechoslovak republic. Under the influence of its Rightist leadership, the Czechoslovak Social-Democratic Party had by that time, along with all the other parties of the Second International, degenerated into a reformist-opportunist party. The Rightist leaders of the party pursued a policy aimed at increasing bourgeois influence in the working class and defending capitalism. The essence of the line followed by reformist parties was that their leaders went over completely to the point of view of the bourgeoisie and proved to be even greater chauvinists than the capitalists themselves. Their line of reasoning in the press, at meetings and in Parliament was on a par with editorials in such newspapers as Švehla's *Účinkov* and Kramář's *Národní listy*. They cultivated nationalistic sentiments in broad segments of the population, called for increasing and improving armaments, and attacked Communists perhaps even more fiercely than did the bourgeoisie.¹

The CPCz waged an unremitting struggle against the spread of social-reformism within the workers' movement. In fact, the history of the CPCz may be described as the history of the struggle of Communists against the influence of opportunism, reformism, Masarykism and social-democratism in the working class and upon the non-proletarian segments of the working people and the intelligentsia. The CPCz matured and grew strong in the struggle against anti-Marxist trends in the country, while the Right-wing leaders of the Social-Democratic Party of Czechoslovakia, as part of the opportunist Second International, pursued a policy of subordination to the interests of the bourgeoisie.

The parties of the Second International wanted to "kill" capitalism by legal means and avoided even the thought of revolution or of educating the masses for revolution. The Rightist Social-Democratic forces in Czechoslovakia, who were actually led by Masaryk, fought, not for the interests

¹ Kl. Gottwald, op. cit., pp. 72-73.

of the working class, but for reforms and for the preservation of their capitalist society. They used a kind of "flexible" approach, which they modified depending on the place, the time and the overall situation, so that many workers among the Social-Democrats got the impression that their party was conducting a class struggle. The Rightist Social-Democratic forces in Czechoslovakia used broad tactical manoeuvres to conceal the bankruptcy of their political line and at times succeeded temporarily in pulling part of the split proletariat over to the line of class collaboration, as was the case in 1918 and again in 1938. Knowing this, the CPCz waged an unrelenting struggle to win the Social-Democratic workers to its side and for militant working-class unity. This struggle to free all workers from the influence of Right-wing Social-Democracy was conducted against a background of sharp class confrontations with the bourgeoisie.

**The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia
in the Struggle Against Imperialism
and the Imperialist Policies
of the Bourgeoisie**

Bourgeois Czechoslovakia was a typical country of finance capital and a bulwark of imperialism in Eastern Europe. Czechoslovak monopoly capitalism was fraught with new crises and new class confrontations between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as the Czechoslovak monopolists kept increasing their wealth through force and exploitation.

The class contradictions within the country grew increasingly acute. Masaryk's response to the growing discontent among the people, especially within the working class and the middle and petty bourgeoisie, was promises and slogans, coupled with increased police repression.

Meanwhile, concentration of capital in Czechoslovakia had reached a high level. Such enterprises as the joint stock company of the Škoda munitions factories in Plzeň, the Vít-

kovice plants, and the Bat'a shoe factory in Zlín, were connected with international cartels. Approximately 40,000 workers were employed at the main Škoda factory in Plzeň, and another 20,000 in the mines near the city of Most. This high concentration of industry forced the Czech bourgeoisie, headed by Masaryk, to reckon with the demands of the working class during the periods of its revolutionary activity.

The Czechoslovak working class was among the most highly organised and united in Europe. For a quarter-century, the Communist Party had been bringing the theory of socialism to the workers' movement, educating it in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, arming it ideologically and helping the growth of its political prestige and enhancing its influence on the domestic and foreign policies of the Czechoslovak bourgeois government.

Once the Czechoslovak bourgeois state had been set up, the monopolies, who had won political dominance in the country and were receiving support from foreign imperialists, stepped up political reaction along every line. Both class and national oppression increased. Masaryk's, and later Beneš's, demagogic "democratic" promises and pronouncements were used to camouflage reactionary policy in all confrontations between the proletariat and the Czech and Slovak bourgeoisie. The government always sided with the monopolies, as evidenced by the role played by Masaryk and Beneš in suppressing the workers of Kladno and Ostrava in 1918, 1920, 1932 and 1938.

In bourgeois Czechoslovakia, as in other Western countries, the capitalists made wide use of bribery to ensure the support of eminent political figures. Documents published in 1953 disclose that Tomáš Masaryk received "gifts" amounting to fifty million Czechoslovak crowns from Czech monopolists.

Masaryk served the interests of the financial magnates, strengthening their power in the country by proposing bourgeois "reforms" and appealing to the sympathies of the petty bourgeoisie and officialdom.

The so-called "Hrad group",¹ headed by Masaryk, brought all the bourgeois parties under its sway, placing them at the service of Czechoslovak finance capital.² A political resolution of the CC CPCz (1930) described the Hrad as the embodiment of the concentrated bourgeois forces. It pointed out that the Hrad and its head, President Masaryk, were playing an ever increasing role in the process of concentrating the forces of the bourgeoisie. The Hrad was the political representative of finance capital through which the latter established its political influence in all the bourgeois parties.

The Hrad regrouped the political forces of the bourgeoisie to correspond to the needs of Czechoslovak capital. For example, the National Socialist Party was subordinated to the Hrad through Stránský and Beneš; the Social-Democratic Party was flooded with theorists and economists from the Hrad; the leadership of the Agrarian Party passed to the Hrad wing of Udřala-Viškovský; Hrad men were put forward as candidates during elections; and so forth.

In international affairs, Masaryk and Beneš pursued an imperialist and anti-Soviet foreign policy. The Czechoslovak Government carried on negotiations with Rumanian rulers regarding possible intervention in the Soviet Union. The Communist Party exposed and denounced the government's dishonest policy of concluding secret military treaties with Rumania and Poland while it was considering the question of recognising the Soviet Union. Raising this question, Beneš at the same time helped to supply Czechoslovak arms to Rumania, Poland, Lithuania and Yugoslavia in preparation for a war against the Soviet Union.

The CPCz exposed the reactionary essence of the bourgeois government and, in particular, showed how the government had put the whole tax burden on the working people

¹ *Hrad* derives from *Pražský Hrad* (Prague Castle)—the residence of the President of the Republic.—Ed.

² See *Dějiny KSČ*, pp. 277-78.

and guarded the capitalists against their revolutionary actions.

The Communist Party urged the government to solve the problem of assistance to the unemployed. The response to this was exclusion of the Communist faction from Parliament. Huge protest demonstrations took place in Prague, Moravská Ostrava and elsewhere, against which the authorities sent the police. Mass arrests were made. In addition, the government victimised the working-class press, destroying thereby the meagre vestiges of bourgeois democracy.

The Communist Party condemned the Czechoslovak Government for prosecuting hungry unemployed for stealing bread, while helping its own members get rich, at state expense, on military contracts.

The Communist Party organised the working people to resist government repression. It was fighting against the kind of state in which the banks, factories and huge estates belonged to monopolists; against a state whose government machinery was a weapon used by the capitalists to fight the working class; against a state in which the working people were suppressed. It was fighting for a workers' and peasants' state.

The CPCz explained that it was also fighting for satisfying the day-to-day needs of the working people, for sufficient food for the working people, for adequate unemployment benefits, for lower rents, for meeting the needs of the village poor, the farm labourers and the small peasantry. But this did not push into the background the Party's main concern, which was the proletarian struggle for revolution, for the expropriation of the bankers, factory owners, speculators, landowners and kulaks.

During the world economic crisis of 1929-1933, emphasis in Czechoslovak industry shifted heavily towards production in light industry to meet the demands of the world market. At the same time, Western imperialists would not admit Czechoslovakia to the world markets with her producer goods. As a consequence, heavy industry, with the excep-

tion of Škoda's armaments plants, dwindled, especially during that period.

The Communist Party discussed all these problems at its Fifth Congress in 1929, and adopted decisions on the problems of the temporary stabilisation of capitalism, the mounting danger of war and the growth of Czechoslovak imperialism in connection with the greater activity of the "Little Entente," headed by Czechoslovakia. The election at this Congress of a Marxist-Leninist nucleus in the Central Committee laid the basis for a decisive struggle against anti-Party deviations and Social-Democratic relapses. A new stage in the development of the CPCz began. Although this period also saw fresh attempts to split the Party and a revival of Left sectarian and Right-wing elements, the Marxist-Leninist Party nucleus succeeded in overcoming them as it educated the rank and file in the struggle for socialism and for turning the CPCz into a Marxist-Leninist Party.

The next landmark on the road towards consolidating Marxism-Leninism in the Party was the Sixth Congress of the CPCz, held in 1931, that is, during the world economic crisis which also affected Czechoslovak industry. The Czech bourgeoisie, unwilling to give up its huge profits, put the whole burden of the crisis onto the shoulders of the working people; its sole objective, as is the case with the bourgeoisie of any imperialist country, was to extract maximum profit from production, no matter what.¹

Unemployment began to grow rapidly after 1929. By the time of the Congress in 1931 there were 750,000 unemployed, and by 1933 the number of totally unemployed reached almost one million.

The working people pinned all their hopes in the struggle against hunger, poverty, unemployment and oppression on the Communist Party. Therefore, the Congress received mass deputations and a great number of greetings from workers who saw in the CPCz a defender of their vital interests.

¹ See *Dějiny KSČ*, pp. 286-98.

The Congress agenda items included: the political and economic situation in the country and the tasks of the CPCz; the trade union movement; the national and agrarian problems; the youth question.

Many speakers dwelt on the political and economic situation in the country and the tasks of the CPCz. There was unanimity of views on all the major problems: on the general world crisis and the economic crisis in Czechoslovakia; on the aggravation of the basic contradictions of the capitalist system; on the tactics of the CPCz.

The Congress heard a report on "The Agrarian Crisis and the Tasks of the CPCz in the Countryside", which dealt with the agrarian crisis in the capitalist countries, the rapid development of agriculture in the Soviet Union, and the CPCz's policy in the peasant question.

A report on the national question described the status of the nations and nationalities in the country and the nationalities policy of the CPCz. The Party advanced as a fundamental principle the right of suppressed nations to self-determination. The problems of nationalities were linked at the Congress with the crisis of the Versailles postwar political system and its possible revision with respect to Czechoslovakia. Hence the tasks of the CPCz to fight against militarism and, above all, against Czechoslovak imperialism.

The Sixth Congress of the CPCz resolved that, in view of the exceedingly hard lot of the working people, and proceeding from the fact that the economic crisis revealed and greatly aggravated the contradictions between the vital interests of the proletariat and the interests of decaying capitalism, Communists had to address themselves to the everyday misfortunes, needs and interests of the working people of town and country. Communists had everywhere and in all cases vigorously to defend the interests of the working people and organise a mass struggle for the satisfaction of their needs. For this they had to launch, in opposition to the bourgeois programme of hunger, unemployment, and imperialist war, a concrete programme for establishing pro-

letarian power. As they expanded the front of the struggle by drawing into it ever greater numbers of working people and promoting the development of their struggle into a general counter-offensive, they had to consistently endeavour to spread and strengthen the conviction among the masses that capitalism must be abolished if the working class was to live. This conviction strengthened the will of the working people in the struggle for power.

The Communist Party's influence among the working people of Czechoslovakia grew from year to year as it scored ever greater successes in its work among the masses. Among the most significant of these was the miners' strike of 1932 in the Most District, which the ECCI held up as an excellent example of how a united front of the working people should be organised in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. Another successful CPCz campaign was to muster the peasants in Slovakia and some other regions of Czechoslovakia for the fight against forcible payment of debts by the peasantry.

The CPCz also made successful headway in its struggle against imperialism and in preparing conditions for a socialist revolution. The Party's growing political and organisational prestige among the masses enabled it to bring increasing pressure to bear upon the government in behalf of the working people.

Directly connected with this kind of popular pressure on the government was the establishment in 1934 of diplomatic relations between the Czechoslovak Republic and the Soviet Union.

Hitler's rise to power in Germany had increased the danger of a new world war and portended a re-examination of the postwar peace treaties, which meant that the very existence of an independent Czechoslovak state might be challenged. In this case, even the Czech bourgeoisie could not ignore the popular movement organised by the Communist Party against the forces of reaction within the country. Under mass pressure, the Czechoslovak Government banned

the National Socialist Party in 1933, and itself began to seek outside forces on whom it could depend in the struggle against nazism. This is what led the Czechoslovak Government to bid for closer ties with France and to consider the possibility of establishing diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. Moreover, it was pressure from the masses, led by the CPCz, that forced Beneš's government to sign a mutual assistance treaty with the USSR in 1936. The treaty, which demonstrated the peaceful policy of the USSR, played a definite role in the Soviet Union's struggle for world peace.

The treaty did not, however, bring about any real change in the foreign policy followed by the Czechoslovak Government. On the contrary, the latter tried to use its recognition of the Soviet Union to its own advantage. The direction taken by Czechoslovak imperialism was characterised by the following measures: the priority development and reorganisation of industry to meet the needs of war production; increased appropriations for militarisation and the build-up of the army; the proposed introduction of pre-conscription training; and, finally, the law which militarised the country. Beneš's government also subscribed to the Anglo-American note on the conflict in Eastern China; signed a secret military pact with Rumania and Poland; secured Czechoslovakia's participation in the International Reparations Bank and the steady penetration of Czechoslovak war industry into Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia. Within the country, the government tried to break the growing resistance of the working people.

In the meantime, the Communist Party launched an extensive anti-fascist and anti-imperialist propaganda campaign and championed democratic freedoms and national and state independence. To these ends it organised a united working-class front, drawing all anti-fascists into the movement.

But then came Munich. What happened during that crucial period in Czechoslovakia's history was subsequently summed up as follows in the Theses of the CC CPCz on the

occasion of the tenth anniversary of people's democracy in Czechoslovakia: "The treachery committed in Munich by the ruling circles of Britain and France, with the full support of the USA, turned over Czechoslovakia to German imperialism for ravage and plunder. Our people, who were filled with determination to take up arms against Hitler Germany and to defend the independence of the Republic, were sold out by the Western powers for the sake of an anticipated war against the Soviet Union. Only the Soviet Union faithfully fulfilled its commitments and was ready to come to our aid. However, our national bourgeoisie, with full support from the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party, rejected assistance from the Soviet Union, and this anti-popular policy led to the total destruction of Czechoslovakia's independence. When the time came for the bourgeoisie to prove in deed the patriotism and devotion to democracy it had always so loudly professed, it disgracefully capitulated, betrayed the people and trampled on national and democratic freedoms."¹

After Munich, although the contradiction between the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie and the proletariat was not removed, the contradiction between German imperialism and the national liberation movement of the entire Czechoslovak people became basic. This movement and the struggle to establish a people's democracy were headed by the CPCz. The bourgeoisie was now divided; part of it, hoping to gain from the victory of German imperialism, went into the service of the nazis. The other part, economically and politically tied to Western capital, sided with the Western countries. This was the group headed by Eduard Beneš.

It was perfectly obvious, however, that neither part of the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie took interest in a Soviet victory. Only the working people of Czechoslovakia were vitally interested in victory for the Soviet people.

Initially, the anti-fascist part of the bourgeoisie, whose

¹ *Rudé právo*, April 16, 1955.

ultimate aim was to reinstate the "first", pre-Munich, republic, went along with the working people.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia took cognisance of this alignment of class forces and used the contradictions within the various groups of the bourgeoisie in the interests of the working people. Hence the CPCz slogans at that time calling on the masses to mobilise their forces for the struggle against fascism and collaborationism, that is, against the nazis and that part of the Czech bourgeoisie which was collaborating with them. In this struggle the CPCz used every means including armed popular uprisings and guerrilla tactics (the Slovak partisan movement, the resistance movement, the Prague popular uprising, etc.). Under the circumstances, the basic objective of the CPCz was to regain the sovereignty and independence of the Czechoslovak state. The Party worked hard to achieve this objective. While entering into a temporary alliance with the anti-fascist pro-Western part of the bourgeoisie, the CPCz did everything to see that the proletariat stood at the head of the resistance movement. The CPCz tactic fully justified itself. The CPCz inspired and organised the masses of working people and strengthened the alliance between the working class and the peasantry. The victories scored by the Soviet Union in the war against nazi Germany raised the prestige of the Communists in Czechoslovakia and helped ensure the success of the CPCz's work among the working people as it led them in the struggle for Czechoslovakia's independence.

**The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia
Against Capitulation to Nazi Germany**

The Seventh Congress of the CPCz (1936) was of special historic significance in the development of the communist movement in Czechoslovakia. Proceeding under the motto of "A National Front for the Defence of Peace Against Hitler, for Bread and Freedom!", the Congress demonstrated the

solidarity of workers in multi-national Czechoslovakia with the builders of socialism—the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union.

The Seventh Congress heard and discussed reports on the question of uniting the working class and all working people in the struggle against fascism, war and the onslaught of capital; on the struggle for trade union unity in Czechoslovakia; on the CPCz's membership and organisational matters; on the question of drawing youth into the struggle against imperialism and the impending danger of fascism; and others.

The Report of the CC CPCz covered the following group of questions: the threat to peace and the struggle to preserve peace; the CPCz's position in defending mankind and the Republic from Hitler; development of the class struggle; the independent class policy of the working class of Czechoslovakia; the struggle against fascism within the country; the possibility of forming a National Front government; the CPCz's task of achieving monolithic unity.

The second report embraced the following topics: the consequences of the bourgeois policy of class peace as the main cause for division in the Czechoslovak workers' movement; the results of the policy of class peace in the trade unions; the capitalists' plan of action against the workers; the causes of the spread of "yellow" trade unions; the class struggle in the economic sphere; the CPCz's policy on the creation of a united front of working people against the growing fascist threat in Czechoslovakia.

The Communist Party warned of the danger that fascism posed to Czechoslovakia. German imperialist aggression threatened a number of countries, including Czechoslovakia, whose peoples were in danger of losing their national independence. The working people of all nationalities in the Republic were vitally interested in maintaining peace and entering into a close alliance with the USSR. Reactionary forces, however, were trying to destroy the alliance between Czechoslovakia and the USSR and to encourage Czechoslo-

vakia to support the militarist policy of nazi Germany. The Communist Party clearly saw that the reactionaries would not remain reconciled to good-neighbourly relations with the USSR for long, and that they would form a bloc of various parties to establish a fascist dictatorship in the country. The CPCz's answer to this impending reactionary offensive was to unite the working class, all anti-fascists and all progressive and democratic forces in the country to counter fascism.

The Communist Party denounced the stubborn resistance of the reactionary elements in the leadership of the socialist parties to its proposal for a single anti-fascist front in Czechoslovakia. At the same time, it considered it feasible to establish a militant alliance of parties which could succeed in alleviating the situation of the working people. It demanded that capitalists be forced to pay their tax arrears; that a tax be imposed in the interests of the working people on the multi-million assets of all banks and joint stock companies; that all such revenues be used to create jobs for the unemployed and to provide assistance to the hungry; that the debts of the peasant poor and the small handicraftsmen be cancelled; that workers' wages and unemployment benefits be maintained and that punitive expeditions into the country for collecting arrears from the peasants cease; and that the social interests of workers, peasants and other poor segments of the population be protected.

The CPCz also considered it feasible to join in a militant alliance with the socialist parties to rid the government apparatus and the army of pro-fascist officials and officers, to expand the civil rights of soldiers and to wage a joint struggle for influence in the Sokol sports societies and shooting clubs. The CPCz fought against the dissolution of workers' organisations, against arrests of Communists. It opposed surrendering Czechoslovakia to the mercy of Hitler and called for close friendship with the USSR and support of the Soviet Union's peaceful policy.

The Communists of Czechoslovakia—the vanguard of the people and defenders of its vital interests—supported all

measures aimed at strengthening the democratic rights of the people, including the right to assemble, to form unions, to maintain a free press, to strike, to struggle against fascism and to defend the Republic from foreign and internal enemies.

The CPCz relied on the revolutionary traditions of the people. It called on the members of the socialist parties to enter into a militant alliance with the Communists against fascism, and declared that it fully realised its responsibility to the international revolutionary movement and would do everything in its power to prevent fascism from taking over Czechoslovakia.

The clear and firm position taken by the CPCz met the vital interests of the working class and all working people of Czechoslovakia.

The exact opposite of this, however, was the policy pursued by the bourgeois ruling circles of Czechoslovakia and the bourgeoisie itself. Having given French capital some economically advantageous positions within the country, bourgeois Czechoslovakia also oriented her foreign policy towards France and her bloc with Poland, Yugoslavia and Rumania. Those states were supposed to form the main bastion in the *cordon sanitaire* against the Soviet Union. But this did not mean that Czechoslovakia had fallen completely under the sway of French capital. In fact, the alliance with France showed a tendency to flag from time to time. With the struggle among the imperialist powers mounting, the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie sided with those states which seemed most likely to help preserve a united imperialist front against the USSR and the revolutionary workers' movement.

The Czechoslovak bourgeoisie was quite consistent in maintaining a hostile policy towards the USSR. In everything else, however, the capitalists of Czech, Slovak, German and Hungarian nationality were at each other's throats. Even the camp of the Czech bourgeoisie itself was not united; it was torn by its own internal contradictions. A sharp struggle raged between a group headed by the Živnostenská Bank, on the one hand, and the financial centre of the Agrarian Party, on

the other. The Živnostenská group carried great influence and controlled the upper echelons of the government apparatus. President Masaryk and Foreign Affairs Minister Beneš never made a decision of major importance without first consulting with J. Preiss, the head of Živnostenská Bank. That group also had its loyal supporters among the leaders of the National Socialist and Social-Democratic parties.

Gradually, however, it was the Agrarian Party that gained headway on the political front. It succeeded in winning key political positions in the country and in taking over the major organs of state power. But when it came to the struggle against the Communist Party's influence on the popular masses, it turned out that the two seemingly "irreconcilable" groups of capitalists found a common language. A bloc of the big bourgeoisie was formed under the leadership of the Agrarian Party; its aim was to establish its own dictatorship and seek rapprochement with Hitler Germany.

These bourgeois politicians stood at the helm of the Czechoslovak Republic for an extended period of time, all the while creating the false impression that they were pursuing an unaltered and independent foreign policy. Masaryk and Beneš skilfully sustained this illusion.

Actually, however, the foreign policy of bourgeois Czechoslovakia was not national in nature, since the bourgeoisie did not defend the interests of their native country, the interests of the people. Moreover, Beneš's foreign policy was not democratic, for it was set by the financial oligarchy and was completely contrary to the interests of the working people. And it was not independent, for it was inspired and determined by the policy of the Western powers.

The Czechoslovak capitalists' propaganda predicted that the Soviet Union was bound to collapse. Despite the mutual assistance treaty with the USSR, the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie aided and abetted the anti-Soviet forces. According to an official report submitted to the League of Nations, before 1938 Czechoslovakia spent 568 million crowns from the state treasury to support all kinds of anti-Soviet ruff-raff.

Thus, during the critical days when the country was directly threatened by Hitler Germany, two distinct tendencies, reflecting the interests of two groups of the bourgeoisie, appeared in the policy of the Czechoslovak ruling circles.

First, the big bourgeoisie, headed by the Agrarian Party, was making an open and brazen bid to establish a fascist dictatorship and to subordinate the country to nazi Germany. This group felt that any unification of the country's anti-fascist forces in an alliance with the USSR was unacceptable and threatened the very foundations of the capitalist system.

Second, the other group, headed by Beneš, although counting on a secret compromise with nazi Germany, oriented its foreign policy towards the Western powers. When the Western powers let it be understood that they would willingly sacrifice Czechoslovakia as payment to Hitler for attacking the USSR, the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie proceeded to play its treacherous role: contrary to the will of the people, it offered no resistance to the Munich *diktat* and rejected the Soviet Union's offer of assistance.

In its struggle against imperialism and the impending fascist threat, the CPCz devoted a great deal of attention to the young people of Czechoslovakia, drawing them into its revolutionary work and countering the influence of fascist organisations that were infecting the younger generation with chauvinism. It mobilised the country's youth for the struggle against war and nazism and for the expansion of the Czechoslovak anti-fascist and anti-imperialist youth movement.

The CPCz continued to fight for a strong alliance with the Soviet Union and, together with progressive organisations in the West, conducted a struggle against the spread of fascism and the danger of nazism. It urged the government and Beneš not to capitulate, but to fight, to organise a nation-wide war if Hitler attacked. As Gottwald recalled, "we proposed and insisted on these measures and this policy. But unfortunately our words were not heeded then. The people, though it wanted to defend itself, was not sufficiently united

and organised; it was not on a high enough level politically to assert its will. The nation was caught unawares by the betrayal at Munich. We warned against Munich, we fought against it; we never did and never will agree with it. We foresaw even then that Munich was only the beginning, that nazi imperialism would not be satisfied with Munich, that Hitler would go further after Munich, that after Munich would come the 15th of March. And in this case, unfortunately, we were again proved right. That which we warned against and which we wanted to prevent, happened."¹

The foremost champion of Czechoslovakia's independence was the Communist Party, which waged a tireless struggle against the spread of fascism and against capitulation. However, the forces of reaction betrayed Czechoslovakia. The Munich tragedy stunned the entire progressive world.

Although the Soviet Union had initially agreed to come to Czechoslovakia's aid on the conditions that France did too, it was now prepared to render military assistance to Czechoslovakia even if France did not. But it could do this only if Czechoslovakia defended herself and if she asked for Soviet help. The Czechoslovak bourgeoisie, however, chose to capitulate to German imperialism.

The Communist Party exerted every effort to prepare the people for struggle against nazi Germany and against capitulation, and for armed resistance in the event of a direct German attack on Czechoslovakia.

The peoples of Czechoslovakia expressed their readiness to resist a fascist onslaught, and it was at that time that the CPCz laid the foundation of the National Front, which included all the anti-fascist and democratic forces of the country.

The peoples of Czechoslovakia were vigorous in their protest against the impending Munich compact. In Prague, on September 21, 1938, a quarter of a million people took part in a demonstration led by the Communist Party. The CPCz raised the cry: "The Republic is in danger!", and the whole

¹ Kl. Gottwald, *Úýbor z díla*, Vol. II, pp. 102-03.

country responded, showing resolute determination to resist aggression. The Communist Party led the people's resistance to a nazi *diktat*. On September 23, 1938, the country was mobilised, and shortly thereafter, mobilised units took up their positions in the border regions. The whole country watched with strained attention as the country's defences were being prepared, and the working people wholeheartedly joined in the endeavour. The nation was prepared for struggle, and this was due most of all to the efforts of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

The bourgeois parties, however, did not want to co-operate with the Communists in those critical days and betrayed the people. The bourgeois government accepted the conditions of the Munich agreement in spite of all the appeals of the CPCz and in spite of the fact that the people were ready to fight nazism.

The Communists, as true patriots, had done everything they could to prepare for the defence of their country against nazi Germany. They and the people as a whole denounced the President for capitulating and fleeing the country in 1938. Beneš's excuse—the same excuse used by all the reactionary capitulators—was that the German army was too powerful and was ready to attack at any moment. Actually, however, this fear was unfounded. According to the testimony of war criminal Wilhelm Keitel at the Nuremberg trial, it was exceedingly fortunate for Germany that the situation did not lead to military operations. The fact is that at that time Germany's border positions were weaker than those of Czechoslovakia. In the event of war, the German army would have had to break through the Czechoslovak border fortifications, but it was not in a state of readiness for such a move.

This provided added evidence that the Communist Party's proposed policy of active defence with reliance on help from the Soviet Union was well grounded, and that the capitulation of the Czechoslovak Government, headed by Beneš, was historically unjustified.

After Munich, nazi Germany launched its further offensive operations. London and Paris continued to pursue their capitulatory policy towards the growing nazi demands as other peace-loving peoples of Europe were threatened with enslavement.

It was not long before the Second World War broke out, having arisen due to the exacerbated contradictions of monopoly capitalism.

Nearly all of the bourgeois political parties in the Czechoslovak territory occupied by nazi Germany during the Second World War refused to struggle against nazism and betrayed the Czechoslovak people. Only the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia remained true to the people and headed its struggle against the aggressor. It organised an internal resistance front and led the anti-fascist liberation struggle of the Czechs and Slovaks from the very first days of the occupation.

The CPCz showed that the only true friend and liberator that the Czechs and Slovaks had was the Soviet Union. It showed through actual struggle against the nazis that the non-proletarian parties refused to defend even the bourgeois freedoms in the Republic—all for the sake of preserving the capitalist system in Czechoslovakia. Most of those parties not only failed to resist, but actively helped fascism to demoralise the working people, spread anti-Soviet propaganda and in every possible way to weaken the Czechs' and Slovaks' will to fight and to defend Czechoslovakia's independence.

2. THE COMPLETE AND FINAL VICTORY OF SOCIALISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA— THE TRIUMPH OF MARXISM-LENINISM

In 1945, the Czechoslovak working class, in alliance with the peasantry, carried out a national and democratic revolution. As stressed at the Fourth Regional Conference of the

CPCz, held in Prague in March 1948, it was a revolution effected by peaceful means, a revolution in which the Czechoslovak people took power away, firstly, from the German occupation forces and, secondly, from the most venal and traitorous part of the Czech and Slovak bourgeoisie.

In March 1945, at the initiative of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the National Front was formed—a bloc of Czechoslovak democratic, anti-fascist forces based on the alliance of the working class, the working peasantry, small businessmen and the intelligentsia. The National Front included the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the National Socialist Party, the People's (Catholic) Party, the Social-Democratic Party, the Communist Party of Slovakia and the Slovak Democratic Party. In April 1945, the Czech and Slovak National Front Government, set up in the city of Košice in Slovakia, came to power and proclaimed the People's Democratic Czechoslovak Republic.

One of the first steps taken by the government was to ban the Agrarian and other reactionary parties representing the interests of monopoly capital.

The reactionary elements in the leadership of the bourgeois parties which were part of the National Front were set to fight against the policy of the CPCz and the National Front, and were counting on support from foreign imperialist forces. In essence, then, two camps, or two political trends took shape within the National Front. The leaders of the bourgeois parties learned very little from the war and occupation. They continued the political tactics used by the old parties of the pre-Munich republic's coalition governments and tried to bring into the National Front their characteristic parliamentary practices of deception, lying, bribery, corruption and betrayal of the people's interests. But the correlation of class forces in the country had changed radically, with the result that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia became the leading political party of the National Front.

The National Front, as A. Zápotocký pointed out in December 1951, was founded on a solid programme. Its pro-

gramme and unconcealed objective was to transform the Czechoslovak Republic, taking it through a people's democracy phase, into a socialist republic.¹

As soon as the country was liberated, the leaders of the bourgeois parties began working for the revival of capitalism, for the consolidation of private property and the return of factories and banks to the capitalists. For its part, the Communist Party began by actively pursuing the National Front policy of disengaging the working people from the bourgeoisie. The CPCz knew that stiff battles for socialist transformations were in store, and for this reason it set itself definite tasks based on the concrete historical conditions of that time. It was necessary to strengthen the system of national committees, the revolutionary nature of which had already been proved by their participation in state and social administration.

The conditions of the class struggle demanded that new national security machinery be set up to safeguard the people's revolutionary gains.

It was necessary to create a people's army as an instrument of political power in the hands of the working class. It was necessary to create a national system of managing the entire economy; to solve the exceedingly important agrarian problem by providing land to the peasants and creating a ramified network of co-operatives in the countryside; to build, strengthen and unite mass organisations of youth, to form a single union of farmers and, what was especially important, of trade unions; to ensure, on the basis of proletarian internationalism, equality among the nations and nationalities and to strengthen the state unity of the Czechs and Slovaks on the basis of complete equality. It was also necessary to continue strengthening the friendship between Czechoslovakia and the USSR.

The CPCz, as leader of the working class, had to mobi-

¹ See *Rudé právo*, December 19, 1951.

lise all its strength for the struggle to fulfil these tasks. It was an ideological, political and economic struggle, all in one. As Gottwald explained, "we as a party now have to prove that we know how to value the confidence of the people and the nation, that we not only know how to fight against the enemies of the people and the nation, but know how to strengthen, deepen and utilise the victory achieved in our national liberation struggle in order to build a genuinely new, a genuinely democratic and a genuinely people's republic".¹

National committee and National Assembly elections were held in 1946. The reactionaries had counted on a victory in the parliamentary struggle, but the results of the elections showed that it was the Communist Party that was becoming the most influential party in the country. It received 40 per cent of the votes in the election, which was more than any other party received. The May 1946 elections demonstrated to the world that a large majority of the Czechoslovak people approved of the new, people's democratic regime and displayed great confidence in the Communist Party—the initiator and leader of revolutionary change.

Supporting the CPCz's measures aimed at strengthening the National Front and the people's democratic regime were the Left Social-Democrats. The Right Social-Democrats, however, acting as agents of the bourgeoisie, made efforts to split the working class and thus impair its effectiveness in the struggle for socialist transformations. The Communist Party gradually eliminated this hotbed of bourgeois influence and prevented any split in the working class from occurring. As for the other non-proletarian parties, the CPCz often had to expose the traitorous role played by their leaders and their connections with Western imperialist powers.

In accordance with the initial government decrees, the first enterprises to be nationalised were those belonging to the big foreign bourgeoisie, the German capitalists, the col-

¹ Kl. Gottwald, *Účbor z díla*, Vol. II, pp. 115-16.

laborationists, notorious enemies of the people and large landowners. Sixty per cent of Czechoslovakia's large-scale industry was nationalised. Part of the country's industry, the land and domestic and foreign trade still remained in private hands. In the countryside, private ownership of land, up to 150 hectares, remained. Nonetheless, nationalisation had made a big dent in Czechoslovak capitalism. Socialist property came into being, and it, in turn, led to the emergence and development of new social relations.

One of the tasks facing the CPCz in connection with the establishment of a people's democratic system and the emergence of nationalised industry was to cultivate a conscious attitude in the working class towards socialist property. The management of national enterprises was now in the hands of the working class.

The nationalisation of industry and the establishment of the state sector put before the people's democratic state the task of national economic planning. In this connection, the CPCz proposed that a two-year economic rehabilitation plan be worked out by the government. In addition, the CPCz raised the question in the government of carrying out land reforms and further nationalisation. These proposals met with stiff resistance from the bourgeois parties.

At the initiative of the CPCz, a two-year national economic rehabilitation plan, covering both industry and agriculture, was drawn up. It was approved by the National Assembly in October 1946, and came into force as a law on January 1, 1947. All the parties in the National Front took part in working out the plan, the aim of which was to match and surpass in the next two years the prewar level of production and thereby to create the prerequisites for raising the living standard of the population. That meant that within two years' time, the economic consequences of the nazi occupation and war would be eliminated in Czechoslovakia.

The idea of a two-year plan attracted the masses and became a powerful material force. Its implementation (1947-1948) made it possible to accelerate the development

of nationalised industries and reduce the share of the capitalist sector in the national economy.

Invaluable fraternal aid in the matter of economic rehabilitation and development was given to Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union.

Once the two-year plan had been approved, the CPCz was faced with a number of new tasks. These were outlined by Gottwald in his address to the National Assembly on October 16, 1946.¹

The working class began the struggle against dislocation and for efficient operation of the nationalised enterprises. It had to prove that it could get along without the capitalists and that the plants and factories would unquestionably work even better. The socialist sector of industry began to develop successfully.

With the emergence of a people's democratic system, the economic laws of capitalism begin to lose effect and the sphere in which they operate narrows. New laws—the laws of socialism—emerge, and the sphere in which they operate gradually expands. So it was in Czechoslovakia, where the means of production in large-scale industry were socialised and thus became socialist property, where labour power ceased being a commodity and the system of exploitation was abolished.

The people's democratic state also faced a serious agrarian problem. The CPCz expended a great deal of effort to work out agrarian reform bills. It was necessary to nationalise the land belonging to large landowners and to redeem the land held by the Catholic church, which owned huge estates in Czechoslovakia. And it was necessary to confiscate land from collaborationists and enemies of the people's democratic system.

The reactionaries launched a frantic campaign against the proposed land laws.

A new constitution had to be drawn up and adopted, and

¹ See Kl. Gottwald, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-90.

this evoked a sharp class struggle, primarily because the new constitution also had to give legal form to the new state system in Czechoslovakia and, above all, the national committees as the basis of the people's democratic state apparatus. The committees were set up by the popular masses during the war as organs of underground struggle against the occupation forces. "The Czechoslovak people," the Theses of the CC CPCz noted, "conducted an uncompromising struggle, in its own country and abroad, against the forces of occupation—a struggle in which over 200,000 Czechoslovak patriots gave their lives. The major decisive factor in the national liberation struggle was the resistance movement within the country itself. Communists, organised into military units in the USSR, and partisan detachments on our territory, were the most selfless fighters against nazism and for national freedom."¹

As the Soviet Army pushed closer and closer to the borders of Czechoslovakia and began the rout of the nazi forces in Rumania, Hungary and Poland, it became necessary for the resistance movement within Czechoslovakia, led by the Communist Party, to organise authoritative local committees to direct the struggle against collaborationists, and to protect industrial enterprises, transport facilities and mines from destruction and sabotage. In this way, the working class entered into active anti-fascist and anti-imperialist struggle for national and democratic transformations, i.e., for a people's democratic revolution. The Communist Party discovered in these committees the form of the future people's democratic government, born of the revolutionary movement of the working class.

Standing high in importance in Czechoslovakia was the national question. The Theses of the CC CPCz gave the following description of the Communist Party's policy on this question: "The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has always steered, and continues to steer, our people towards un-

¹ *Rudé právo*, April 16, 1955.

compromising struggle against all forms of bourgeois nationalism; it seeks to develop in the people feelings of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism. The distinctive character of the Slovak people and its advancement along the road to socialism shoulder to shoulder with the fraternal Czech people are ensured by the national organs, which are the carriers and executors of the state power in Slovakia. The rapid economic advance and flourishing of culture in Slovakia are a testimonial to the triumph of the Marxist-Leninist principles of the Party's nationalities policy. The principle of equality of nations which is embodied in the Constitution of the Republic ensures the opportunity for the all-round development of all nationalities. The results of the CPCz's nationalities policy have meant a serious defeat for the enemies of our peoples' freedom, the bourgeois nationalists, and they have promoted an unprecedented consolidation of friendship between our peoples and the nationalities living in our country. Born in the process of socialist construction are new Czechs and Slovaks, new socialist peoples."¹ Thus, the basic principle guiding the Communist Party in solving the national problem and involving all working people in the management of the state was the principle of proletarian internationalism. This principle also ensured success in pursuing a foreign policy based on strengthening Czechoslovakia's friendship with the Soviet Union. The treaty of friendship and mutual assistance which was concluded between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia in 1943 proved to be a powerful factor in strengthening Czechoslovakia's international positions and guaranteeing the young state against any military intervention by the imperialist countries in the postwar period.

The internal reactionary forces demanded that Czechoslovakia seek the "friendship" and "assistance" of the Anglo-American bloc, and insisted especially on receiving Marshall Plan "aid". The Czechoslovak working people did not

¹ Ibid.

yet fully realise what this would entail. Acceptance of Marshall Plan "aid" would have been tantamount to abolishing the sovereignty of the state, restoring capitalism and relinquishing all of the gains of the people's democratic revolution. It would also have meant rejection of friendship and close co-operation with the Soviet Union. The Theses of the CC CPCz, "Ten Years of People's Democratic Czechoslovakia, 1945-1955", said in this regard: "In striving to have Czechoslovakia included in the Marshall Plan, the bourgeoisie was endeavouring to weaken and destroy our ties of alliance with the Soviet Union. The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, saw the alliance with the USSR as the guarantee of our independence and free development. Therefore, in accordance with the will of the people, it struggled for the preservation and strengthening of allied relations with the Soviet Union and for the establishment of friendly relations with the People's Democracies."¹

The Communist Party took on the serious job of exposing the true nature of the Marshall Plan. It drove home the point that co-operation between Czechoslovakia and the USSR was imperative, for it was clear that this economic co-operation would prevent Czechoslovakia from being sucked into the whirlpool of economic crisis which threatened any country linking its economy with the Marshall Plan. The CPCz entertained no illusions about the Marshall Plan, for it saw from the very beginning that the whole idea of the plan was to open up Europe for American goods and to subordinate her economy to the USA. The CPCz contrasted this road with another, and the only correct road—economic co-operation on a fraternal basis with the Soviet Union. Adherence to the CPCz's line prevented the restoration of capitalism in the country.

The policy of friendship with the Soviet Union strengthened Czechoslovakia's sovereignty in foreign affairs. As a sovereign state and a member of the United Nations, Czechoslo-

¹ *Rudé právo*, April 16, 1955.

vakia opposed the reactionary tendencies in the policy of imperialism, defended her sovereign rights and, together with the Soviet Union, struggled for world peace.

Moreover, the revolutionary transformations taking place in Czechoslovakia were also of international significance, for they showed—contrary to the contentions of bourgeois theorists and revisionists that Marxism was obsolete and that its principles were applicable only to backward agrarian countries—that Marxist-Leninist principles were not only applicable to the building of socialism in an industrially developed country such as Czechoslovakia, but applicable with the highest resultant effect.

The reactionary forces in Czechoslovakia suffered one defeat after another. Their final defeat came in February 1948, when the bourgeoisie's attempt to stage a counter-revolutionary coup by means of a government putsch failed and the people of Czechoslovakia, removing those forces from the government, set out on the road of socialist development.

Soon after the February victory over the forces of reaction, the government promulgated a new draft constitution, which, after a nation-wide discussion, was adopted by the National Assembly on May 9, 1948.

The Constitution proclaimed that the Czechoslovak Republic was a national state, part of the friendly family of Slavic states, and had durable international relations with peace-loving peoples. Czechoslovakia was declared to be a state in which the people passed the laws and carried them out, and where the economy served the people. Economic development was orientated towards the establishment of a social system without the exploitation of man by man, i.e., towards socialism.

The sweeping political victory of people's democracy was fixed in the Czechoslovak Constitution. Power now belonged to the working class in alliance with the working peasantry. State administration was in the hands of the working class, which drew the peasantry into the political life of the coun-

try through the national committees. The country's industry, natural resources, wholesale trade and financial institutions were nationalised, and the principle "the land belongs to those who till it" began to be implemented.

The people's democratic system guaranteed the working people the right to work and rest and freed them from the fear of unemployment and economic oppression by exploiters. Thus, the Constitution fully guaranteed individual freedom and equal rights to all citizens.

Full equality of nations and nationalities was also established. The territory of Czechoslovakia was proclaimed to be a single, indivisible whole. The rights of all citizens to education, work and rest were embodied in the Constitution. The state guaranteed democracy for the majority and set democracy for all as its goal. As early as April 8, 1945, it was pointed out at a conference of functionaries from the Communist Party of Slovakia, that the principle according to which the people are the main source of all power, was not just a pretty or empty phrase, but a current reality. The basic difference between the old, formal democratic constitution and the new, people's democratic constitution was that the latter guaranteed real power to the people.

The Communist Party played a decisive role in the Czechoslovak people's struggle for revolutionary transformations. All the victories of the working class in the building of socialism were connected with the CPCz's leading and guiding activity, the theoretical basis of which is Marxism-Leninism.

The popular masses expressed their full confidence in the Communist Party, for they saw that it was achieving successes in all spheres of social life. The CPCz, the vanguard of the working class, is strong both ideologically and organisationally, as it creatively applies Marxist-Leninist theory. It has close ties with the masses of working people through the trade unions, co-operatives, youth organisations and the national committees, from all of which it draws the forces for socialist construction.

Prior to the people's democratic revolution, the CPCz had roused and organised the people to overthrow the old, bourgeois order. Now, its energies were directed towards inspiring and organising the working people of Czechoslovakia for the building of socialism. This involved cultivating in the working people a conscious attitude towards strengthening their unity, educating them in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, struggling against bourgeois ideology and exposing the lies and slander directed against socialism by anti-communist propaganda. Thus, the task of spreading the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, the struggle against bourgeois ideology, and educating the masses in the spirit of socialism were of cardinal importance in all the work of the CPCz.

The Communist Party grew up in the struggle against reformism, revisionism and social-democratism. As the most progressive, conscious and organised contingent of the Czechoslovak working class, the CPCz guided the entire revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants.

The leadership of the CPCz as a party representing the highest form of the proletariat's class organisation embraced all the other organisations of the working class (trade unions, etc.).

The establishment of people's democratic power was made possible by the CPCz's successful struggle against the influence of the bourgeois parties, including the Right Social-Democrats who were virtually agents of the bourgeoisie within the workers' movement. The attempt of the bourgeois parties to seize power in February 1948 exposed their desire to restore capitalism in Czechoslovakia.

The CPCz conducted a no less vigorous fight against reformism, revisionism, anarchism and social-democratism within its own ranks. In this struggle, the CPCz further consolidated and defended its Marxist-Leninist nature and upheld the unity and cohesion of its ranks on the theoretical basis of Marxism-Leninism. As a result of this tremendous ideological work the CPCz won the confidence of the people and went boldly forward, uniting into a single common

stream the general democratic movement and the working class's socialist movement to establish a people's democratic system.

In this respect, the Ninth Congress of the CPCz was of great significance.

The Communist Party worked out a series of concrete measures for educating the masses in the spirit of the decisions of the Ninth Congress.

In developing the decisions of the Ninth Congress on the ideological questions, the Presidium of the CC CPCz adopted in September 1949 a detailed resolution on the introduction of a Party Education Year, aimed at achieving an all-round rise in the political level of all Communists. It stated that the successful building of socialism required above all that all Communists acquire a thorough knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory, and for this purpose, every primary Party organisation should organise political training for all its members and candidate members.

As a result of these measures, the influence of bourgeois philosophy, pragmatism, voluntarism and Masarykism weakened, and the influence of Marxism-Leninism began to spread and grow.

The Theses of the CC CPCz stated: "The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, which emerged as the vanguard of the working class, has become the leading force of our peoples. It was the initiator and organiser of all the historic victories of our people. The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has led the people of our country from victory to victory under the banner of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, following the great example of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The overwhelming majority of our people feel that the Communist Party is right and have been convinced of the correctness of the road pointed to by all-conquering Marxist-Leninist teaching—the science of the victory of socialism and communism."¹

¹ *Rudé právo*, April 16, 1955.

While drawing on the historic experience of the CPSU and other fraternal parties, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia understood, however, that the general principles of socialist revolution had to be creatively applied to the concrete historical conditions extant in Czechoslovakia. The Party was far from ignoring its own Czech and Slovak national particularities, but at the same time it was careful not to overestimate their role in the socialist revolution.

The new state became a powerful instrument in the proletariat's struggle to bring about revolutionary transformations in the country. The working people were convinced by their own experience that the Communist Party, the guiding force of socialist construction, pursued a correct policy. Taking into account the experience of world socialism, the CPCz was able to define the stages of the socio-economic transformations. It worked out a scientific programme of action and explained this programme and the goal of the struggle—the building of socialism—to the public, making wide use of clear and incisive slogans. This expressed the strength of the CPCz and the correctness of its political orientation.

Prior to February, when the CPCz still shared power with the bourgeois parties, it did not merge with them, but rather pursued an independent proletarian policy in leading the masses and defining the direction in which economic development should go. The bourgeois parties, for example, supported the idea of a two-year plan, but with the aim of rehabilitating the bourgeois economy. The CPCz, on the other hand, involved the masses in the revolutionary, creative work, saw the plan as the beginning of the socialist reconstruction of the country's economy, and set guidelines for a number of years ahead.

The CPCz's leadership was manifested in all of the conscious actions taken by the Czechoslovak working class to destroy the old, bourgeois system, to abolish national oppression and exploitation, and to create a new, socialist society.

The fact that national oppression was completely elimi-

nated in Czechoslovakia on the basis of socialist internationalism was another important success scored by the Communist Party. The Theses of the CC CPCz on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of people's democratic Czechoslovakia had the following to say in this regard: "In contrast to the pre-Munich republic, the present people's democratic republic is a most reliable guarantee of the national freedom and independence of the Czechs and Slovaks; it is a genuine Motherland to the working people of all nationalities who live in it. It is a great accomplishment of the people's democratic system that it abolished the former national oppression, ensured the freedom and fraternal coexistence of all the peoples and nationalities in the country, and forever ended the bourgeois policy of fomenting mutual hostility between peoples."¹

On the ideological front, the CPCz worked hard to strengthen friendship among peoples and considered it its sacred duty in the struggle against bourgeois ideology, Masarykism, opportunism, social-democratism and anarchism, to defend Marxism-Leninism and to spread it among the masses. The CPCz took part in drafting the Declaration of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries and became a signatory to it. It emphasised the significance for the practical activity of Marxist parties of the theoretical basis of Marxism-Leninism, namely, dialectical materialism, which reflects the general laws of development in nature, human society and human thinking. The Declaration said, in part: "Should the Marxist political party in its examination of questions base itself not on dialectics and materialism, the result will be one-sidedness and subjectivism, stagnation of human thought, isolation from life and loss of ability to make the necessary analysis of things and phenomena, revisionist and dogmatist mistakes and mistakes in policy. Application of dialectical materialism in practical work and the education of the Party

¹ *Rudé právo*, April 16, 1955.

functionaries and the broad masses in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism are urgent tasks of the Communist and Workers' Parties."¹

In line with the Declaration, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia took the necessary measures to step up its struggle against the opportunist and revisionist ideas of Masaryk, etc., which still prevailed among a certain part of the intelligentsia and were propagandised by the reactionary Czechoslovak emigration.

The CPCz won high prestige among the fraternal parties. It valued and guarded this prestige, for it enabled it to work in close contact with the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties and to march in step with the working people of all countries. The CPCz realised that the friendship of peoples was a powerful force and a source of further victories in the building of a new, socialist world.

* * *

The victory of the people's democratic revolution and of socialism in Czechoslovakia meant a radical change in the political, economic, ideological and cultural life of Czechoslovakia. This change was socialist in content and national in form.

Marxist-Leninists always examine ideology and culture in indissoluble connection with their economic basis and recognise their class character. "...The class which is the ruling *material* force of society is at the same time its ruling *intellectual* force."²

Giving the basic meaning of a cultural revolution, the decisions of the Tenth Congress of the CPCz said that profound internal changes involved in the building of a new society, the active participation of millions of working people

¹ *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Moscow, 1963, p. 15.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 47.

in running the country, their re-education along socialist lines and the bringing up of a new generation, all this led to a cultural revolution.

The cultural revolution in Czechoslovakia had its own distinctive characteristics. Science, art and culture were on a high level. There was a generally literate population, a high technical level of production and a highly developed intelligentsia. These features meant the existence of more already established prerequisites than in other European countries (Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania and others), and made it possible for Czechoslovakia to accomplish socialist cultural transformations more rapidly.

The establishment of a people's democratic system and the victory of socialism in Czechoslovakia played a decisive role in creating and developing a socialist culture. Radical changes in all spheres of Czech and Slovak social life took place. The power of the landowners and capitalists was broken; the socialist sector won out completely in industry and agriculture; national oppression was abolished; and the vestiges of capitalism in the consciousness of people, which hampered the development and strengthening of the new, socialist culture, were being eliminated. All these changes in economic, political, social and national relations opened up possibilities for socialist transformations in other spheres of life, including the cultural sphere.

Under these circumstances, the socialist state became the basic instrument for organising the building of a socialist culture, since the characteristic functions of this new type of state, functions unknown to exploitative states, are those of cultural development, education and economic organisation. This radically new quality of state power brings to the fore unprecedented tasks, including the task of raising the cultural and technological level of the working people. The state is concerned with the all-round rise of culture needed to achieve broad participation of the working people in state administration, the rapid building of socialism, and the all-round development of the individual.

As brought out in the Theses of the CC CPCz, "Ten Years of People's Democratic Czechoslovakia, 1945-1955", "dependent to a great extent upon the cultural and educative work of state agencies are: the further development of the socialist consciousness of our people; the raising of the vocational skills of working people; the socialist and vocational education of tens of thousands of members of the new intelligentsia, who are closely connected with the people; the further upsurge of culture and of every kind of activity in the field of art; and the use of science and culture as an instrument for building socialism".¹

To bring about large-scale socialist industrialisation it was essential to produce engineers, technicians and highly skilled workers in the Czech and especially in the Slovak regions. This required training new cadres in addition to making use of the sizeable old, predominantly Czech, intelligentsia.

As socialist industrialisation and the socialist reconstruction of the Czechoslovak village proceeded, education and science became accessible to the popular masses. Grassroots talent was given every opportunity to develop, and a new, patriotically minded and consciously socialist intelligentsia began to take shape.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia did an enormous amount of educational work among the masses. The entire activity of the Party was characterised by its ideological and organisational unity, its unwavering faithfulness to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. One of the Communist Party's tasks was to ensure a steady rise in the ideological work of the masses in general, and of cultural workers in particular.

The spreading of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism played a decisive role in the development of the cultural revolution; it enhanced the growth of the working people's political consciousness and their thirst for knowledge. A new type of culture grew and flourished throughout the land; it was

¹ *Rudé právo*, April 16, 1955.

a culture that was socialist in content and national in form, and fundamentally different from the old, bourgeois culture.

The cultural revolution was part and parcel of the socialist revolution, and the Communist Party was the initiator and organiser of the struggle for this revolution—the struggle to discard the bourgeois culture which was alien to the people, while ensuring the historical continuity of all that was democratic and progressive in the cultural heritage of Czechoslovakia. In art and culture, the Party fulfilled its guiding role by fighting against vulgarisation, bourgeois individualism and nationalism, and by championing socialist realism.

* * *

The cultural revolution in Czechoslovakia manifested itself most clearly in the democratisation of public school education. One would think that Czechoslovakia, situated in the centre of Europe and counted among the so-called cultured Western countries, should have had a unified state system of public education. This, however, was not the case.

The Czechs had their own national and progressive traditions in this field, and of special significance was the Czechoslovak people's long history of projects aimed at establishing a unified system of public education. The first such project was worked out by Jan Amos Komenský (1592-1670), a Czech classic educator, world famous for his writings on pedagogy. As he was working on his project, he wrote that the desire "to study the causes, methods, means and goals of the art of teaching" led him to find "the general art of teaching everything to everyone". But Komenský's project was not to be realised in his lifetime, nor in the centuries that followed, right up to the victory of the people's democratic revolution in Czechoslovakia.

The second project in Czech history for a unified state system of public education was authored by Czech physiologist and biologist Jan Evangelista Purkyně (1787-1869). But his project was also never realised.

In the course of the people's struggle for political independence the Czechs developed a revolutionary tradition, a thirst for education and a desire to create a unified public educational system. But all the Czechs were able to accomplish within the framework of Austria-Hungary was the teaching of Czech children in Czech schools. Prior to 1918, the Slovaks had very few state-run Slovak schools, and children were taught in church and private schools. Until the establishment of the people's democratic system, bourgeois ideology held sway in both the Czech and the Slovak schools, and the schools inculcated ideas of bourgeois nationalism in their pupils.

The tradition to struggle for a unified public educational system, which went back to Komenský's works, was preserved and supported by teachers, especially in Bohemia. A characteristic feature of the political parties of all bourgeois countries, including those of bourgeois Czechoslovakia, was that none had a programme for education. It was only after the victory of the people's democratic revolution that such a programme was introduced by the Communist Party, and a radical reorganisation of the school system was made.

The old educational system of the First Republic preserved bourgeois teaching principles and methods, many of which had been handed down since the time of the Reformation. The school gave only formal instruction, while character development was left up to the family and the home. A stiff battle raged in Czechoslovakia around the school issue. In the years of the First Republic, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia considered it imperative that a system of public education be set up along socialist lines, in which the schools would have the simultaneous function of political and general education. This policy was countered by the bourgeois government's policy based on Masarykism, and later on the pragmatism of Příhoda (a Right Social-Democrat and advocate of John Dewey's instrumentalism). The bourgeoisie latched on to Příhoda's reformist ideas and adopted a "new programme of educational reform" in

the spirit of Masaryk's cosmopolitanism. This "new programme" was designed to turn out individuals alien to the progressive traditions of their people. Through its pragmatic "philosophy of public education", the bourgeoisie was trying to introduce, in opposition to a unified socialist system of education, its own programme of so-called positive education. The reform proposed by the Right Socialists would have the schools serve the interests of the capitalist monopolies. Following the American pattern, they would produce "living machines"—skilled labour power for the conveyors of the Bat'a and Škoda factories. The Right Socialists were thus bent on inflicting great damage to the cause of education. It was for this reason that teachers rejoiced when Z. Nejedlý spoke out, insisting on having a law passed that would establish a unified public educational system along the lines of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. The Communist Party criticised the bourgeois school reform projects and put forth its own draft school law. The bourgeois parties' leaders continued to oppose this draft after the Second World War, and tried to block its adoption in the National Assembly. It was only after the plot of the reactionary parties was crushed in February 1948 that the National Assembly finally passed a public education law and created a school system designed to bring up active builders of socialism.

The 1948 law was supplemented by another law in 1953, thus bringing to a completion the process of building a single state school system which included eight-year schools, eleven-year schools and higher educational institutions.

The 1948 law introduced free compulsory education. Under the people's democratic system the school differed radically from that in bourgeois Czechoslovakia: it became an instrument of socialist construction. Children were now brought up in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and of national pride in their socialist homeland and its progressive historical past. The schools offered an education to all children, regardless of their family background. The law provided for school instruction in the social sciences, native and

foreign languages, mathematics, natural science, technology, aesthetics, hygiene and physical culture. It also required pupils to do practical work in some branch of the national economy.

Instruction in all schools was at state expense. Special schools offered a vocational education and enhanced the pupils' general education to prepare them for a higher educational institution. All schools were co-educational. An eight-year education was compulsory. After that, children could go on to either an eleven-year school or to a technical school. Enrolment in institutions of higher learning was open to those who had completed a secondary education.

Subject teaching and character development combined into a single process in the new school. Jan Komenský's dictum—"The school is a workshop of humanism"—became a reality thanks to the socialist system.

The new school was designed to train youth for active participation in socialist construction, in the spirit of genuine patriotism, a high standard of culture and conscious discipline. Noble traits were developed in children—honesty, camaraderie, boldness, courage and persistence in the face of difficulties.

In the sphere of school education, the Czechoslovak Communist Party and Government are guided by Lenin's behest that the school must become "a vehicle not merely of the general principles of communism but also of the ideological, organisational and educational influence of the proletariat on the semi-proletarian and non-proletarian sections of the working people with the object of completely suppressing the resistance of the exploiters and of building the communist system".¹

In this connection, it should be emphasised that the ideological content of school education had changed: it became consistently democratic and based on the scientific Marxist-Leninist world outlook. The school no longer harboured bour-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 132.

geois nationalism, cosmopolitanism, philosophical positivism and religious obscurantism. Instead, love of work and respect for working people were cultivated in children. The new school equipped young people with the fundamentals of scientific knowledge and helped them acquire communist convictions and develop a scientific world outlook. The young people finishing school became fully developed, educated and cultured people loyal to the principles of the new social system.

The school reform had thus led to a system of general education that met the needs of the people's democratic system. The cultural revolution in Czechoslovakia was manifested in the rapid development of the schools, in the broad and comprehensive development of the personality they afforded to youth and in the development of education in the spirit of socialism.

The country's system of higher education was also changed completely with the establishment of people's democratic system. In former times, the bourgeoisie had always maintained that the working class had no need for, and was not up to, a higher education. But all such assertions were refuted by the development of higher education in the Soviet Union and the creation there of a socialist intelligentsia from workers and peasants. With the Soviet experience of organising higher education to draw on, Czechoslovakia was able to train her own intelligentsia made up of people from the working class and the working peasantry. Before, the bourgeoisie had barred worker and peasant youth from institutions of higher learning. Under the people's democratic system, however, the student bodies of these institutions were made up basically of young people from worker or peasant families.

Preparatory courses for workers planning to enrol in higher educational institutions were introduced shortly after the defeat of the reactionary plot in February 1948. In 1949, a clean sweep was made of the higher educational institutions, ridding them of the "gilded youth"—the offspring of

landowners, capitalists and kulaks—and making way for worker and peasant youth. In an address to the country's teachers, Klement Gottwald said that he hoped that by then all prejudiced notions to the effect that the people's system, socialism, hampered science and culture and limited their freedom, were already a thing of the past. Such notions were, of course, nonsense; a people's state needs science and culture of a more varied nature than ever before. Further, Gottwald pointed out that the tasks of building socialism placed great responsibility on students; they had to serve the people honestly and conscientiously. The institutions of higher learning should develop not an aristocracy that looked down upon the so-called "rabble", but a people's intelligentsia that regarded service to the people as its paramount goal. It must not slavishly give in to the desires of capitalist exploiters, but devote itself wholeheartedly to service for the good of the people and the state.

Gottwald's address inaugurated the CPCz's broad programme of cultural development in which secondary and higher education was cast in a new mould and as a result of which a large new intelligentsia began to take shape.

After the February 1948 events, the study of Marxism-Leninism was introduced into the college curriculum. The mastery of dialectical and historical materialism enabled the intelligentsia to advance the development of science and technology more successfully and to lend greater impetus to scientific research in the interests of the people and of socialist construction.

The Soviet experience in setting up its system of higher and secondary education has been of great value to other countries building socialism. Czechoslovakia set up scientific research institutes which worked in direct contact with industry. Every higher educational institution, every university and institute faculty had some factory or enterprise under its patronage, where its students went through practical training. Nothing like this had ever existed in Czechoslovakia before. In turn, the institutes and universities often

invited workers to visit their laboratories to acquaint themselves with the work being done by undergraduate and graduate students and the teaching staff and to make suggestions based on their own practical experience.

The reform of higher education in Czechoslovakia placed the country's higher educational institutions in the service of socialism. Higher education was cleared of the idealist, anti-scientific theories with which the Czech and Slovak bourgeoisie of prewar Czechoslovakia used to muddle the brains of youth. Education was now based on scientific knowledge of the laws of development in nature and society, on the mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory.

Great demands were placed on the schools and higher educational institutions, for they were called upon to prepare young cadres with an all-round education, both scientific and political; develop in them a scientific world outlook and communist morality; and educate youth in the spirit of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism.

* * *

The socialist economy of the Czechoslovak Republic became the basis for the rapid rise in the well-being and cultural level of the population. It underlay the expansion of the network of schools, higher educational institutions, theatres, libraries and clubs; the growth in the number of copies of books and magazines published; the increased number of public lectures given; the increased budget appropriations for public health and social measures; the development and flourishing of national amateur activity, etc.

Profound changes took place in the field of culture, particularly in literature and art, after the people's democratic system was established and the building of socialism began. The best national traditions of Czech and Slovak literature and art and the revolutionary traditions of the workers and peasants were developed. The experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries was used, with due regard given to the national peculiarities of the country.

Broad possibilities opened up for the satisfaction of the spiritual needs of the working people. The latter's cultural level steadily rose, and this, in turn, raised the problem of putting the ideological and artistic content of literary works on a higher level and improving the artistic skills of writers and artists. Increased demands were placed on all those working in the field of culture and art. The creative artists of Czechoslovakia had to have a profound knowledge of the life of Czechs and Slovaks to produce works in which, adhering to the principles of socialist realism, they could reflect the characteristic phenomena of the versatile creative activity of the people, create true-to-life, typical images, etc.

With their ancient historical traditions, science, art and culture in Czechoslovakia reached a high level. The CPCz fulfilled its guiding role here, too, as it continued its resolute struggle for socialist realism and against the old bourgeois ideology, against vulgarism and bourgeois individualism, against the nationalism, cosmopolitanism and formalism that had been fostered by the bourgeois government of the First Republic. It gave full support to the creative enthusiasm and socialist patriotism displayed by people in the arts and sciences, many of whom received state awards. Older works, such as those of Božena Němcová, Alois Jirásek, Smetana, Dvořák, became accessible to all. The world-famous works of Antonín Zápotocký, Marie Majerová, Marie Pujmanová and others were widely published. They captivated the reader by their relevance to life, their connection with the people's struggle for socialism and their bold progressive ideas, which unquestionably were the basis of their artistic truthfulness and power. For their part, contemporary writers strove to find answers to the burning problems of the life and spiritual growth of builders of socialism. They inspired the new man to great achievements in the struggle for socialism.

Transformations were taking place not only in literature and art, but also in architecture. Architects went over completely from constructivism to socialist realism, drawing up

new projects worthy of the new, socialist epoch, yet preserving Czech peculiarities and national expressiveness.

Over the years of building socialism, the cultural requirements of the working people grew. This was characterised by the increase in the number of theatres, ensembles, music schools, libraries, cinemas, mobile puppet theatres, etc. The working people had at their disposal all media of culture, enlightenment and education. Amateur talent activity became increasingly widespread, bringing to light many gifted artists from among the people. The Party gave every consideration to the amateur talent groups that performed for the working people. The tasks of the arts, as important cultural media for the masses of working people, amounted to serving and educating the people. The artistic endeavour of poets, writers, playwrights and other creative artists was of great importance. Music, too, followed a new path of creating works for the people. Workers in the arts applied the method of socialist realism in all spheres of creativity as the struggle went on against formalism and cosmopolitanism.

The CPCz's struggle against cosmopolitanism was aimed against the depreciation and arrogant abasement of the Czechoslovak national culture and the culture of friendly peoples. It was directed towards protecting the country from the pernicious influence of the reactionary culture of imperialism, towards the all-out strengthening of the national socialist culture. The Communist Party made every effort to see that the entire wealth of the national culture was made accessible to the working people.

The flourishing of culture and art in the course of socialist construction in Czechoslovakia is a historic achievement.

One of the great achievements of socialism has been moulding of new people who are devoted to the cause of socialism, distinguished by a new attitude towards labour and socialist property, and strive for the successful development of their socialist society. Such people are guided in their activity by the principles of the scientific, Marxist-Leninist world outlook and consciously create the highest forms of human com-

munity living, co-operation and solidarity. The new people ardently propagandise the ideas of proletarian internationalism and the ideas of peace.

* * *

It is not our purpose here to review the whole process of building socialism in Czechoslovakia. This is a separate subject to which many special studies have been devoted, including one of the present author's books.¹

Here, we should make a special point of examining the principal results of the victory of socialism in Czechoslovakia with a view to exposing anti-communism and revisionism, which have made the building of socialism in Czechoslovakia an issue in the world ideological struggle, and which disparage the achievements of socialism in that country and question the very possibility of the victory of socialism and the socialist character of the revolutionary transformations in Czechoslovakia.

In using this method, anti-communism and revisionism pursue far-reaching aims: by discrediting the experience of socialist construction in a highly developed industrial country, they hope to discredit the Marxist-Leninist teaching as a whole and to strengthen the positions of bourgeois ideology, including Masarykism, which during the events of 1968-1969 was used as an alternative to real socialism.

The old revisionist notion which held that Russia was not ripe for socialism and which Masaryk implanted in Czechoslovakia has been constantly renewed. Today's revisionists apply it to most of the other socialist countries, saying that, for the same reason, Marx's idea of "true socialism" has not been and could not have been realised. That theory would have it that the social system in today's socialist countries is not socialism but a "transitional pre-socialist society", "state capitalism", etc. Thus, bourgeois ideology and revi-

¹ M. A. Silin, *The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The Period of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism. 1945-1961*, Moscow, 1963 (in Russian).—Ed.

sionism take real socialism off the highroad of historical progress and treat it as a phenomenon which was engendered by the specific conditions of backwardness and which cannot serve as an example for other nations, least of all for the working class of developed capitalist countries.

Bourgeois ideologists and revisionists asserted that a backward, "Eastern" socialism had been implanted in Czechoslovakia, a socialism that was incompatible with her developed, "Western" nature, and that therefore it could not be said that there was genuine socialism in Czechoslovakia.

Bourgeois ideology ignores the historical development of the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialism and breaks up the single and cohesive theory of scientific socialism by opposing Marxism to Leninism. It denies the international character of Leninism, claiming that it is nothing other than revision and distortion of "true Marxism" for the purpose of adapting it to the characteristic features of backward countries. Hence the division of Marxism and socialism into "Western" and "Eastern".

Lenin exposed as unscientific the practice of opposing the general principles of scientific communism to national specificities, and proved that they form an organic whole as the general and the particular in socialist development.

Life itself has shown that, contrary to the assertions of bourgeois ideologists, countries with a relatively advanced economy possess particularly favourable conditions for the development of socialism.

As Vasil Bil'ak has noted, "our experience confirms that in countries that were formerly relatively highly developed, socialism has extraordinarily favourable objective and subjective conditions for all-round development and for displaying its advantages"; "at the present time Czechoslovakia is an example of the advantages of socialism and its superiority over capitalism".¹

¹ "Lessons of the Socialist Revolution in Czechoslovakia and the World Today", *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, Russ. ed., No. 5, 1973, p. 10.

The primary result of Czechoslovakia's socialist development over the past quarter-century has been the successful solution of fundamental social problems which had been posed but not solved by the country's entire previous history. Socialism proved to be the only system that ensured victory in the age-old struggle of the peoples of Czechoslovakia for freedom and state independence and sometimes for their very existence.

Socialist relations of production, from the standpoint of forms of property, triumphed in Czechoslovakia by the late 1950s. In 1960, the socialist sector accounted for 98.5 per cent of the national income; 99.5 per cent of the production of fixed assets; 100 per cent of the gross industrial output; 90.5 per cent of the gross agricultural output; 99.9 per cent of the commodity turnover; and 88 per cent of the farm land.

In the period 1962-1964, industry accounted for 82 per cent of the national income, and agriculture—18 per cent.

By the beginning of 1961, industrial and office workers made up 84.2 per cent of the population, with the peasants organised into co-operatives accounting for 11.9 per cent.¹

In 1960, the National Assembly of the Czechoslovak Republic adopted a new, socialist constitution which expressed and formalised the victory of socialism in Czechoslovakia, the basic principles of the socialist social and state system, the socialist code of citizens' fundamental rights, freedoms and duties—socio-political, economic and personal—and provided real political and material guarantees for their realisation.

The Preamble to the new Constitution states: "The social system for which generations of our workers and all working people fought and which after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution became for them an example, has now, under the leadership of the Communist Party of Czecho-

¹ *The National Economies of the CMEA Member-Countries*, 1972, pp. 39, 22 (in Russian).

slovakia, been translated into reality in our country as well.

"Socialism has won out in our country!"¹

Articles 7, 14 and 15 of the Constitution say that the socialist economic system, in which the means of production are socialised and where there is planned management of the entire national economy, is designed to ensure "the full development of the socialist society", which means not only the mighty and comprehensive development of production, but also the constant growth of the standard of living, the gradual reduction of the working day, and the constant development of the physical and spiritual abilities of the entire people. All this taken together will signify the creation of the prerequisites for the gradual transition to communism.²

The Constitution further declares that the supreme aim of the policy of the Communist Party and the socialist state is to build socialism for the complete satisfaction of the needs of the individual and the assurance of his harmonious development.

Articles 16 and 19 state: "...The whole cultural policy of Czechoslovakia, education and training are conducted in the spirit of the scientific world outlook, Marxism-Leninism, in close relationship with the life and work of the people";³ "the rights, freedoms and duties of citizens serve ... the free, all-round development of the individual, the application of the abilities of citizens, and at the same time the cause of strengthening and developing the socialist society. As the society develops, the rights, freedoms and duties of its citizens become broader and deeper."⁴

In Article 18, the Constitution proclaims Marxism-Leninism to be the basis of the scientific management of all public affairs: "...In a society of the working people, the

¹ V. Flegl, *Ústava ČSSR*, Praha, 1973, pp. 43-44.

² Ibid., pp. 50, 53-54.

³ Ibid., p. 54.

⁴ Ibid., p. 56.

achievements of science are fully applied on the basis of the scientific world outlook in the management of society and in the planning of its further development."¹

During its 25 years of socialist development (1948-1972), the economy of Czechoslovakia, which had stagnated prior to that, moved along the road of free, steady and rapid progress.

In that period, the gross social product grew 390 per cent; the national income, 330 per cent, and industrial production, almost 660 per cent. The average annual growth rate of industrial production in that period was 8.8 per cent. In the period 1964-1971, that rate was higher than in developed capitalist countries, amounting to an average of 6.6 per cent as compared with 6 per cent for France, 5.7 per cent for the FRG, 4.8 per cent for Italy, 2.8 per cent for Great Britain, and 4.2 per cent for the United States.

Despite a considerable reduction of land area used and the number of people engaged in agricultural production, the gross agricultural product in 1972 was about 80 per cent higher than in 1948, while output per permanent agricultural worker went up 240 per cent on the average.

All this has provided for a high and constantly rising living standard in the CzSR. Essential differences in the level of economic development between different regions and between living standards in town and country have been removed.

Personal consumption grew 230 per cent in the 25 years, and the present five-year plan envisages an annual growth of not less than 5 per cent.

In level of nutrition, clothing manufacture and durable goods production, Czechoslovakia ranks among the most advanced states in the world, and in overall social consumption it surpasses any capitalist country. The working day in Czechoslovakia is one of the shortest and the vacations there are among the longest in the world; social security cov-

¹ Ibid., p. 55.

ers all strata of the population, and everyone has the right to free medical services.

Czechoslovakia now occupies one of the leading places in Europe and the world in the effectiveness of its systems of education, public health, social security and satisfying the cultural needs of the people.

The 14th Congress of the CPCz, noting the fact that a sense of social optimism prevails among the people under socialism, stressed that never before in the history of Czechoslovakia had every working person been so confident in the morrow and in his future.¹

Assessing the level of development achieved, the Congress ranked socialist Czechoslovakia among "the most developed countries of the world", especially in terms of national per capita income, level of technical development in industry and construction, intensity of large-scale agricultural production, density of the transportation system and effectiveness of the scientific and technical basis.²

A great achievement of socialism in Czechoslovakia has been the establishment of indissoluble unity and fraternal friendship among her peoples and the practical solution of the nationalities question, which, by virtue of the specific features of the country's historical development, was one of its most acute and complicated problems.

Lenin drew attention to this back in 1920, when in a conversation with B. Šmeral he stressed that Czechoslovakia "has come out of a milieu of extremely sensitive national relations", that she received from the Austro-Hungarian Empire "a very difficult legacy", namely, the nationalities question, which in the conditions of bourgeois Czechoslovakia was an "extraordinarily complex problem".³

Its special complexity stemmed from the fact that bour-

¹ See *XIV. sjezd Komunistické strany Československá*, Praha, 1971, p. 41.

² *Ibid.*, p. 589.

³ *Recollections About V. I. Lenin*, Vol. 6, Moscow, 1969, p. 269 (in Russian).

geois Czechoslovakia, as a multi-national state, incorporated the nationalities of a number of neighbouring states. These nationalities had frequently passed from one country to another as the borders of hostile states were recarved, and this tended to keep an edge on relations among the nationalities after their unification within the bounds of Czechoslovakia.

According to the 1921 census, the population of Czechoslovakia consisted of the following nationalities¹: Czechs and Slovaks, 8,860,937 (of which 2,250,000 were Slovaks); Hungarians, 745,431; Germans, 3,123,586; Ukrainians, 461,849; Jews, 180,974; Poles, 75,853; Rumanians, 13,974; Southern Slovenes, 2,108; other nationalities, 9,789.

Czechs made up 49.4 per cent of the total population.

Masarykist bourgeois "democracy" was based on the antagonism of nations.

The dominant nation were the Czechs, on behalf of whom the bourgeois state organised the deindustrialisation of Slovakia and fanned national hostility as it pursued a policy of national enslavement, oppression and rapacious exploitation of the national minorities.

The development of national Czech monopoly capital, in line with the general laws of imperialism, led to greater national oppression on the new historical basis, causing the increasingly oppressed nationalities to fall further and further behind in their economic, social and cultural development and turning the national regions into agrarian and raw material appendages of the Czech industrial centres.

Slovakia, which in 1937 accounted for only 7 per cent of the industrial potential of the country and about 15 per cent of its national income, especially felt the burden of oppression.

The chauvinistic Masarykist ideology of "Czechoslovakism" which prevailed in the period 1918-1945 and which

¹ *Sčítání lidu v Republice Československé ze dne 15/II-1921*, Part I, Praha, 1921.

held up the idea of a "single Czechoslovak nation" with its "two faces", or "two branches", the Czechs and Slovaks, in effect meant the complete negation of the national characteristics of the Slovaks, of their right to independent national development and self-determination.

The constitution, the laws, and the entire bourgeois superstructure stood at the service of the ideology and practice of "Czechoslovakism" and were permeated with the spirit of the imperialist policy of the forcible assimilation of the Slovaks as well as other nationalities.

Masaryk and Beneš tried to make this chauvinistic ideology appear scientifically valid by claiming that the Marxist-Leninist programme for solving the nationalities question was inapplicable under the conditions prevailing in Czechoslovakia. Beneš, for example, said that he would never recognise the Slovak nation by virtue of his scientific conviction that Slovaks were Czechs and that the Slovak language was a dialect of the Czech language.

In the course of its struggle for socialism, the CPCz overcame the grave consequences of the dominance of the chauvinist Masarykist ideology and policy aimed at fanning inter-national conflicts, and strove in the complex conditions to creatively apply the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the question of nationalities, to establish internationalism as the ideology and policy of the proletariat in the nationalities question, i.e., to implement a Leninist nationalities policy. The CPCz was guided in its work by Lenin's behest to regard the nationalities question through the prism of the class struggle of the proletariat, to subordinate its solution to the interests of the socialist revolution, which is internationalist in character, always to consider the main thing in the nationalities question to be the unification of the working people of all nations and nationalities in the struggle for the new social system, and to regard this unity as a basic prerequisite for victory of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism. The CPCz combined the struggle for socialism with the struggle for national liberation, guided by the following

basic Marxist conclusion: only socialism brings with it the complete social emancipation of the working people from all kinds of oppression; only socialism can ensure the full and complete solution of the nationalities question, since, as Marx and Engels pointed out, "in proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end".¹

The CPCz's programmes on the nationalities question reflected the dialectics of the Marxist-Leninist statement and solution of this question: to move, through the complete social and national emancipation and development of all nations towards their unification and growing closer together, towards the creation of fundamentally new relations among them—relations of complete trust, friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance based on community of the class interests and goals of all working people.

The first experience in creating a new international community on the scale of a multi-national state was that of the Soviet Union, which inherited from the tsarist empire the economic and social backwardness, ignorance and poverty of formerly oppressed nations and nationalities.

Leonid Brezhnev has pointed out in this regard: "That is the point at which we had to start, and, besides, to be the first to do so, because the proletariat of Russia and its Party had no one's experience to fall back on in tackling these most complicated tasks. The plain fact is that such experience simply was not there."²

The Leninist programme for the complete and final solution of the nationalities question on the basis of socialism was aimed at thoroughly overcoming all the consequences of national oppression and inequality, for which purpose it was not enough merely to proclaim the formal equality and independence of nations; their factual inequality had to be abolished.

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 125.

² L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Moscow, 1972, p. 19.

Bourgeois ideologists, opportunists and revisionists rejected in principle the possibility of the victory of socialism in a multi-national country where, in their opinion, socialism would inevitably crack up on the age-old national problem, on ineradicable national hostility. The enemies of socialism held that there was no power on earth that could turn this hatred into friendship, that could eradicate inter-national antagonisms and create new, stable and viable international communities in the place of collapsed empires.

However, the enemies of socialism miscalculated. Lenin and the CPSU gave the world such a wonderful force—the Leninist nationalities policy and the socialist perspective.

The experience of the Soviet Union has clearly refuted all the bourgeois prophecies, baring the failure of bourgeois ideology in the nationalities question and the failure of all forms of bourgeois nationalism, including Masarykism. The anti-communists, however, continue to insist that the nationalities question is the “Achilles’ heel of Marxism” as they falsify the experience of the USSR and claim that the nationalities question remains unsolved in other socialist countries and tends to mar relations among the socialist countries.

A special place in this anti-communist manoeuvre has been given to the falsification of Czechoslovakia’s experience in solving the nationalities question and a complete denial of socialist achievements in this sphere.

In fact, however, the experience of Czechoslovakia clearly and irrefutably proves that the nationalities question is the Achilles’ heel precisely of bourgeois ideology, which has confused the nationalities question and has been tangled up in it, bringing its theory on this question to an impasse by maintaining in essence that national antagonisms are eternal and irresolvable. The reactionary essence of the chauvinistic concepts of Masarykism has been thereby exposed in the eyes of the masses. The victory of socialism in Czechoslovakia meant a new historic victory for the ideology of proletarian internationalism.

It was emphasised at the 14th Congress of the CPCz that in the course of its history the CPCz "implemented the Leninist principle of equality and equal rights in relations among nations and national minorities",¹ that socialism led to the victory of "genuinely equal and fraternal relations between the Czechs and Slovaks and other nationalities".²

In a speech at a meeting held in Staroměstské Square on February 23 to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the February Revolution, Gustav Husák, reviewing the results of the solution of the nationalities question in the CzSR, said: "Capitalist Czechoslovakia writhed in national contradictions. Socialism solved the nationalities question in our country fairly, in the Leninist spirit, ensuring the fraternal unity and co-operation of the Czech and Slovak peoples and other nationalities. From a backward, agrarian land, Slovakia has turned into an industrially developed republic, and her economy has become an important part of the single Czechoslovak economy."³

Indeed, the economy of Slovakia developed at a faster rate than that of Czechia.

The faster rate of economic advance in Slovakia, the course towards a levelling of the economic development of both parts of the republic underlay the practical solution of the nationalities question in Czechoslovakia.

"The efforts of the CPCz," the 14th Congress of the CPCz stressed, "which were aimed at effectuating the Marxist-Leninist nationalities policy, were crowned with great successes, above all in the economic sphere. In the past 20 years, Slovakia's share in the state's overall volume of industrial production grew from 14 to almost 24 per cent."⁴ In 1965 the volume of per capita industrial production in Slovakia was 59 per cent of the figure for Czechia; in 1970

¹ *XIV. sjezd KSČ*, p. 53.

² *Ibid.*, p. 165.

³ *Pravda*, February 24, 1973.

⁴ *XIV. sjezd KSČ*, p. 145.

it was 69 per cent. In the period 1961-1965, the per capita agricultural output there averaged 98 per cent of that in Czechia; in 1970 it was 104 per cent.¹

By 1972, industrial production had increased 660 per cent in Czechoslovakia as a whole, and 1,300 per cent in Slovakia over the 1948 level.² Slovakia today produces much more than did Czechoslovakia's entire industry before the Second World War.³

The present five-year plan (1971-1975) also provides for a higher development rate in the key branches of material production (especially the chemical, machine building and metallurgical industries) in the Slovak Socialist Republic than in the Czech Socialist Republic, so that the total social product in Czechoslovakia will show an increase of about 25 per cent, with an increase of approximately 40 per cent in Slovakia; industrial production will grow 27 to 29 per cent in Czechia, and 55 to 57 per cent in Slovakia.

The plan envisages the following production increases for the Czech and Slovak Socialist republics, respectively: machine building, about 40 per cent and more than 60 per cent; the chemical industry, 45 to 50 per cent and 75 to 80 per cent; light industry, almost 25 per cent and over 50 per cent.⁴

By the end of the fifth five-year plan period labour productivity per industrial worker in Slovakia will reach almost the same level as in Czechia.⁵

As we can see, overcoming the actual inequality of the republics was "programmed" from the outset into the single economic policy of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. That policy was based on the decisions of the Ninth Congress of the CPCz (1949), which had proclaimed the socialist indus-

¹ *XIV. sjezd KSČ*, p. 593.

² See L. Svoboda, "The Living Behests of February", *Izvestia*, February 21, 1973.

³ *XIV. sjezd KSČ*, p. 127.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 618.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

trialisation of Slovakia to be the economic basis of the socialist solution of the nationalities question.

And this past inequality has been basically eliminated. So far as overcoming its vestiges in different spheres of life is concerned, this is no longer the "nationalities question", but a social problem of the harmonious, all-round development of the society as a whole. This means the complete solution of the nationalities question under conditions of the complete and final victory of socialism in Czechoslovakia.

The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Slovakia Josef Lenárt cited the following figures characterising Slovakia's all-round social progress over the period of socialist construction. About 300 large industrial enterprises had been built in Slovakia, and about 600,000 persons were employed in industry (as compared with a prewar figure of 120,000). Labour productivity had increased 5-fold in industry, and 4.3-fold in agriculture over the 1948 level. In prewar Slovakia there was only one institution of higher education with 2,000 students; in 1973 there were 13 such institutions with a total of 52,000 students. In 1945, there were a mere 3,000 research workers in all of Czechoslovakia; in 1973 there were 33,000 researches in Slovakia alone. In 1916, there was not a single Slovak secondary school in Slovakia; in socialist Slovakia there is not a single village without people who have a higher education or students in higher educational establishments.

Lenárt also pointed out that there were no longer substantial differences in standard of living between the Slovaks and Czechs, which in the past used to cause much dissatisfaction.¹

A vivid description of the international ideological significance of Slovakia's leap from backwardness to progress and the complete and final solution of the nationalities question in Czechoslovakia has been given by Vasil Bil'ak, who has shown that Slovakia's socialist achievements eclipse in their

¹ See *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, Russ. ed., No. 8, 1973, pp. 43, 45.

social significance all contemporary examples of "economic miracles" in capitalist countries: "Much is said nowadays about various kinds of economic miracles. In this connection it should be noted that everyone who knew Slovakia in the past and objectively compares her with modern Slovakia has to admit that she has changed her visage with fabulous speed. Slovakia has grown young, more healthy and more beautiful. Her children no longer have to wander the face of the earth in search of work; they happily live and work at home, have good prospects and a reliable future that only socialism can give them. There is no reason for our people to have a sense of inferiority, as bourgeois propaganda tries to persuade us they do. . . . In level of development of key industries and in standard of living, our Republic, although it is small, can confidently compete with any country in the world."¹

Formed and now living in a period of prosperity and drawing together in Czechoslovakia are socialist nations whose social structures are of the same type, coincide in their basic features and develop according to the same laws towards social homogeneity and full social equality.

The efforts of the CPCz in solving the nationalities question consistently in the spirit of Leninist principles culminated in the creation of the Czechoslovak federation, which represents the final state and legal form given to the relations of complete equality of rights and complete trust that were established between the Czech and Slovak peoples.

As brought out by the 14th Congress of the CPCz, "over the period of its existence, the Czechoslovak federation has justified itself; it constitutes the solid class and international basis of fraternal co-operation among the nations and nationalities in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic".²

Article 20 of the socialist Constitution of Czechoslovakia proclaimed "the equal rights of all citizens regardless of

¹ Vasil Bil'ak, *Pravda zostala pravdou*, p. 314.

² *XIV. sjezd KSČ*, p. 578.

nationality or race..."¹ The experience of the Soviet federation, as well as the experience of creating new national relations within Czechoslovakia, has showed that a socialist federation is the most suitable state and legal form for establishing and developing new national interrelations in the socialist state.

The federal structure of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic was the result of applying to Czechoslovak conditions the Leninist principle of the self-determination of nations. This principle is the necessary condition for the voluntary unification of nations into a single state, which ensures the consistent equality of rights of the peoples in all spheres of social life, the prosperity of the different nations and nationalities, and their increasing co-operation and convergence.

The further strengthening of relations between the Czechs and Slovaks in the spirit of the Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism through the introduction of the federal structure of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, marked the beginning of a new and higher stage in the development of the Czechoslovak state.

The socialist social and state system, which is the main guarantor of the constitutional rights of all the nationalities in the country, ensures the exercise of these rights in all spheres of life through the Leninist principle of socialist federation. It ensures the harmonious combination of state needs, that is, the interests of all the nations and nationalities of Czechoslovakia, the unity of the Czechoslovak economy, and the specific needs of the Czech and Slovak republics.

Constitutional Law No. 143/1968 C3, which established the federal structure of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, became effective as of January 1, 1969, in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of independent Czechoslovakia.

At the same time, this meant the broadening and strengthening of the rights of all the other nationalities (ethnic groups) living in Czechoslovakia.

¹ Quote from V. Flegl, *Ústava ČSSR*, p. 56.

The preamble to the constitutional law stresses that the federal state, created in the spirit of the humane ideals of socialism and proletarian internationalism, is designed to ensure "conditions for the all-round development and improvement of the well-being of all citizens, guaranteeing them equal democratic rights and freedoms irrespective of nationality...".¹

The constitutional law of October 27, 1968 "On the Status of Nationalities in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic" (No. 144/1968 C3) established the guarantees, possibility and means for the equal and all-round development of the citizens of Hungarian, German, Polish and Ukrainian (Ruthenian) national origin, who, "in the spirit of the policy of the National Front, shall make their creative contribution to the country's advance, simultaneously developing their own forms of national life...".²

The law guarantees the nationalities the right to an education in their own language, the right to unite in ethnic cultural and social organisations, the right to a press and information in their native language, etc.

The law also forbids "any forms of coercion aimed at denationalisation", and stresses that "the citizen shall freely choose a nationality for himself according to his own conviction", that "belonging to any nationality cannot serve as a restriction on any citizen in his political, economic or social life".³

The complete and final victory of socialism in Czechoslovakia and the solution of the nationalities question indicate that the CPCz has properly fulfilled and continues to fulfil its historic mission as the leading force of the working class and all the working people of Czechoslovakia. The 50-year-long history of the CPCz is one of heroic and selfless struggle for social and national liberation. The Party has been an integral part and motive force of the major events in the

¹ V. Flegl, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

² *Ibid.*, p. 160.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

modern history of the peoples of Czechoslovakia, who have a deep sense of gratitude to and admiration for it.

The 14th Congress of the CPCz stressed: "The victorious 50-year road of the Party's work and struggle confirms the correctness of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the viability of the general principles of the building of socialism in the conditions obtaining in our country."¹

In his speech at the ceremonial meeting in Staroměstské Square, held in honour of the 25th anniversary of the victory of the February Socialist Revolution in Czechoslovakia, Leonid Brezhnev noted the international significance of that victory: "February 1948 was a crucial event of postwar history. It was a major class battle in the world arena, won by socialism. It was a radical turn in the destinies of the peoples of Czechoslovakia."²

Comrade Brezhnev said that Czechoslovakia, having won real independence, would never again become a pawn, a toy in the hands of the imperialists, that, on the contrary, her role and influence in international affairs was growing steadily.

Although the anti-communists maintained that socialism as conceived by Lenin could not be built in Czechoslovakia, this Leninist, this true socialism, triumphed in Czechoslovakia in an exceptionally short span of time—in 12 years, which is an unmatched historical precedent, particularly since it involved radical social transformations. Consequently, the Leninist conception of socialism is not antiquated or suitable only to backward countries; on the contrary, it "works" most effectively precisely in developed countries. In this respect, the experience of Czechoslovakia is of world historical significance.

Gustav Husák noted the following on February 23, 1973: "...In the last 25 years, Lenin's plan of building a socialist society has been implemented. Socialism as a new and high-

¹ *XIV. sjezd KSČ*, p. 564.

² *Pravda*, February 24, 1973.

er social system, has justified the hopes of the peoples. It has thoroughly confirmed its advantages in our country as well. In this quarter-century it has solved the basic national, state and social problems of our society. It successfully dealt with problems before which capitalism had capitulated. . . .

"Our socialist present guarantees the working people a high living standard, complete social confidence and reliable prospects. . . .

"We have a powerful economic potential. We have the support of powerful and dependable allies. Therefore we look with confidence and optimism into the future, which will bring further prosperity to our socialist homeland."¹

The implementation in Czechoslovakia of Lenin's plan for building a socialist society was a crushing defeat for Masarykism, according to which "Russian programmes and methods" did not represent "true Marxism" and Leninism was a "typical Russian" teaching that was absolutely unsuitable for civilised countries and inapplicable to the conditions of Czechoslovakia.²

However, life has shown not only the historical groundlessness of Masarykism, but also the possibility of its revival by the forces of foreign and internal reaction for use against socialism in our day.

¹ *Pravda*, February 24, 1973.

² Masaryk, *Světová revoluce*, Praha, 1925, p. 211

CHAPTER 6

THE REVIVAL AND FAILURE OF MASARYKISM

1. THE EVENTS OF 1968-1969 AND THE REVIVAL OF MASARYKISM

A characteristic feature of the present period is the intensified ideological struggle in the international arena. The forces of peace, democracy and socialism are everywhere increasing in strength and number; socialism has become the leading force of world social development. For precisely this reason imperialism is stepping up its subversive activities against the socialist countries, trying to disunite them, to undermine the socialist system from within, to weaken its international influence and alter the world balance of power in its own favour. As brought out in the Report of the CC CPSU to the 24th Congress of the CPSU, "the Czechoslovak events were a fresh reminder that in the countries which have taken the path of socialist construction the internal anti-socialist forces, whatever remained of them, may, in certain conditions, become active and even mount direct counter-revolutionary action in the hope of support from outside, from imperialism, which, for its part, is always prepared to form blocs with such forces.

"The danger of Right-wing revisionism, which seeks, on the pretext of 'improving' socialism, to destroy the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism, and paves the way for the penetration of bourgeois ideology, has been fully brought out in this connection."¹

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 17.

Over a considerable period of time, the ideologists of world imperialism, for their part, conducted an extensive campaign of ideological subversion to discredit the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and disarm the working class and all the working people of Czechoslovakia ideologically. For this, they brought out the old weapon of the Czech bourgeoisie—Masarykism.

The events of 1968-1969 signified a revival of the opportunist forces, which set themselves the task of restoring capitalism and chose Masaryk's name as the banner of their struggle for this purpose. Many monographs and articles published during that period attempted to "purify", ennoble, elevate and adapt Masaryk for a "new model of socialism", to raise the banner of "the Great Czech"—Masaryk.

The Right-wing opportunists demanded an official return of Masarykism as the state ideology with a view to using it immediately as a weapon against the Communist Party and Marxism-Leninism.

How was this expressed? Let us examine the facts.

One of the Czechoslovak non-proletarian parties advanced the slogan: "Back to Masaryk!" Right-wing opportunist elements in the CPCz organised a series of lectures on the life and work of Masaryk to be read at educational institutions and elsewhere, and also set about to republish Masaryk's works.

The organ of the Czechoslovak Socialist Party *Svobodné slovo* declared Masarykism to be the basis of "Czechoslovakia's own socialism", stating that "we shall always proceed from Masaryk's ideas!",¹ which meant opposing and replacing Marxism with Masarykism.

In 1968 and 1969, Czech newspapers and magazines published articles on various aspects of Masaryk's scientific, political and diplomatic activity. For example, the Czechoslovak press displayed particular interest in an article published by the Moscow newspaper *Sovietskaya Rossiya* in May 1968,

¹ Quoted from *Marxism-Leninism—the Single International Teaching*, 2nd edition, Moscow, 1968, p. 136 (in Russian).

entitled "Whose Interests Did Masaryk Defend?" Many Czech and some foreign newspapers responded to that article.

On May 16, 1968, *Rudé právo*, organ of the CC CPCz, published an article, "T. G. Masaryk and the Soviet Union", in which Czech historian Dr. Zdeněk Sládek of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences' Institute of the History of the European Socialist Countries gave his commentary on the "basic facts and conclusions" in the Moscow newspaper article.

Sládek wrote: "The article about T. G. Masaryk, which was published in *Sovietskaya Rossiya* in connection with a review of V. Ardamatsky's book *Retribution*, gives a distorted picture of the attitude of the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic towards Soviet Russia and of his role in the history of the Czech and Slovak peoples." Without denying the facts brought out in the Soviet writer's article, Sládek found justification for many of the actions taken by Masaryk, but gave his own interpretation of the facts mentioned in Ardamatsky's book.

"Since the current renaissance of Czechoslovakia," Sládek wrote, "appeals to the democratic traditions connected with the name of Masaryk, this is not a distortion of history. If our society is to achieve a higher level of democracy than in the period of the First Republic, it must by no means orient itself towards the latter's negative, but towards its positive aspects."

Sládek agreed that "Masaryk was a bourgeois politician and ideologist, with all the consequences this entailed", but at the same time felt that it was "extremely incorrect to ignore the fact that he was a democrat who fought all his life against absolutism and provincialism, a political figure whose services not only in the struggle for an independent Czechoslovak state, but for its democratic structure, are unquestionable".

In Sládek's view, the First Republic's democratic traditions were disparaged after 1948, and this belittlement was

of an "instrumental nature", since the campaign against so-called Masarykism unfolded in a period that was far removed even from bourgeois democracy. He felt that the *Soviet-skaya Rossiya* article had a similar function in that it gave a "one-sided interpretation of the situation here" in order to produce a "distorted picture" in the minds of Soviet readers.

In essence, Sládek's article helped the Right-wingers at that time to use Masarykism as a weapon in the political struggle against the Communist Party, particularly since it did not reveal the class character of Masaryk's activity either as a philosopher or as president. In speaking about the "instrumental nature" of the CPCz struggle against Masarykism as an ideology opposed to Marxism-Leninism, Sládek stressed "Masaryk's democratic traits" and the democratic nature of the First Republic, but he did not explain who, from a class standpoint, that democracy was for; he completely ignored the fact that Masaryk's democracy was democracy for Kramář, Bat'a and others in a small group of Czechoslovak monopolists, but certainly not for the masses of working people. Who did such democracy suit? Sládek did not answer this question.

At that same time, *The New York Times* published an article by its former Moscow correspondent Walter Duranty, one of the three foreign correspondents who, in 1924, had been granted permission to attend the final court session in the trial of Boris Savinkov.¹ This report by an eye-witness of the trial corroborated the facts pointed out in the *Soviet-skaya Rossiya* article.

Many observers had no doubts as to the objectivity with which the historical facts were presented in the Soviet press. On May 15, 1968, for example, the Yugoslav newspaper *Politika* also responded to the Soviet article, giving the commentary of its Moscow correspondent, who wrote: "... pro-

¹ It was proved at that trial that Masaryk was involved in financing the terrorist activity which Savinkov's group directed against the leaders of the Soviet state.—*Ed.*

bably no one is about to deny the facts relating to the biographies of Masaryk and Beneš that have been cited in the newspaper [*Sovietskaya Rossiya*—M. S.].”

On May 9, 1968, the newspaper *Práce* published an article by Czechoslovak historian V. Vávra, entitled “T. G. Masaryk and the Legionnaires. How Was It All in Reality?” The introduction to the article stated that “the newspaper has received many letters and resolutions expressing indignation at the tone of the article about Masaryk that was published in the Soviet press”. Vávra’s article amounted to justifying the actions taken by Masaryk that had been described by the Soviet writer, and showing that there was nothing wrong in these actions and that Masaryk and not his critics was right.

Later, in April 1970, *Rudé právo* published an article—“What Has the Analysis at ‘Škoda’ Shown?”—by I. Vaněk, who described how the enemies of socialism had conducted an open struggle against the CPCz at the country’s biggest machine building complex. For example, “at the locomotive plant of the complex, the Socialists began their activity by hanging up provocative placards directed against the CPCz and approving Masaryk’s and Beneš’s activity”.

These were ideological tactics aimed at discrediting socialist democracy, contrasting it with “Masarykist democracy” as an ideal democracy and justifying Masaryk’s anti-communism and some of his anti-Soviet actions. These were attempts to distort definite historical facts, as well as the nature and direction of their illumination in the Soviet press.

Another basic method of ideological subversion that should be mentioned here was the attempt, along the lines of Masarykism, to treat what was a political problem as a national problem, or “the Czech question”—to present the internal political crisis as a national crisis, and counter-revolutionary activity as almost a struggle for national liberation.

The magazine *Nová mysl*, for example, carried an article entitled “Tomáš G. Masaryk. Some Remarks and Ideas Towards an Historical Assessment of the Man”, written by Old-

řich Janeček, who said: "We are solving today's Czech and Slovak problem under socialist conditions. It is no accident, therefore, that today Masaryk's name reappears among us spontaneously and consciously. In his time, he, too, deliberated about our current crisis, about the 'Czech question', about the social question, about Russia and Europe. He, too, asked where this nation came from and where it was going. And he didn't merely ask. At a definite time, he stood at the head of the nation. The emergence of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918 was associated with his name."¹

Giving a general assessment of Masaryk's personality, Janeček also attempted in his article to synthesise Masaryk's humanism and religiosity with his anti-Marxism and anti-communism, with the aim of turning the humanist traditions and religious vestiges in the people's consciousness against socialism.

Janeček wrote: "Masaryk stands before us not only as the founder of the Czechoslovak Republic, not only as a politician and philosopher of humanism and as a thinker who countered dogmas and blind faith with reason, but as our most significant anti-Marxist ideologist and as a politician who, when he was President of the First Republic, struggled against communist views in theory and in practice." Besides this, Janeček stressed, he grew up among religious people and "was a believer himself".²

And this was the person whom Janeček called "the touchstone of the strength or weakness of our current thinking and our current policy".³

A widely used method of ideological subversion involved attempts to unite all generations around an anti-socialist platform, to draw youth and students into anti-socialist activity, for which purpose certain facts from Masaryk's biography were given corresponding treatment.

¹ *Nová mysl*, No. 6, 1968, p. 680.

² *Ibid.*, p. 682.

³ *Ibid.*

As an example, on December 20, 1968, the newspaper *Zemědělské noviny* published a long article commemorating Masaryk's return to Czechoslovakia on December 20, 1918. The article said in part: "The day of Masaryk's victorious return remains for all generations an example of the triumph of the striving for freedom and independence which binds together all generations."

A great deal was written that year about events in Czechoslovakia, especially by foreign correspondents in Prague. They devoted much attention to stories about how Masaryk's memory was revered in Czechoslovakia, and found various pretexts and facts to bring up the subject of Masaryk.

United Press International's Prague correspondent, for example, sent in this report on November 2, 1968. "Yesterday, hundreds gathered at the statue of King Václav to pay their respects to the temporary memorial to Tomáš Masaryk, the founder and first President of Czechoslovakia who has long been the *target of sharp Soviet attacks* [emphasis added—M.S.)."

"Earlier," the report continued, "Czechoslovak authorities behaved as if Masaryk never existed. His place in history was completely ignored, but the Soviet Union attacked him as a 'dangerous bourgeois nationalist'.... The temporary memorial was actually a challenge to the Soviet Union, which still attacks Masaryk and Beneš, the second President of Czechoslovakia."

Why did the correspondent find it necessary to slander the Soviet Union? This is not a difficult question to answer. His job boiled down to fomenting anti-Sovietism and nationalism, to play on the people's national feelings. The UPI correspondent was trying to capitalise not only on the real sentiments of the Czechs, among whom there were those who sincerely revered the memory of the First Republic and its presidents, but also on the fact that not all Czechs had an accurate understanding of the class content of Masaryk's activity and the class essence of his "humane and democratic socialism".

Gustav Husák said subsequently that during the events tendencies towards *idealising Masarykist democracy* were accompanied by slurs against all the ideals and achievements of socialism, the principles of the Marxist-Leninist theory, and the principles of the communist social system.¹

The question that comes up naturally at this point is: what was this Masarykist democracy really like and how were its basic principles propagandised?

To gain some insight into this question, let us take an example of the "idealisation of Masarykist democracy" taking place in those days. Let us return to Janeček's article about Masaryk. In it, Janeček attempted to present a picture of Masaryk's democracy in its generalised form. In his opinion, "the meaning of the national-democratic revolution in the future Czechoslovak Republic is the desire to realise democracy" which represents the political organisation of "the society on an ethical, humane basis", the paramount objective of which is not dominance, but the organisation "of progress in all spheres of human endeavour".²

The state, in Janeček's view, is not a class category, but primarily a national category, since "the development of a nation is the goal", while the state is but a "nation's means".

Democracy, Janeček felt, rejects classes, militarism, tyranny, secret diplomacy and exploitation, and it affirms the dominance of labour, humanism, the equality of people and nations, parliamentary forms of the state, debate as the method of resolving controversial problems, and so forth.³

If, however, he were writing about Masaryk's democracy from Marxist-Leninist positions, he would certainly have compared this conception with the Marxist view of democracy.

The characteristic feature of Janeček's presentation was that he described democracy unrelated to period or concrete

¹ *Rudé právo*, June 3, 1969.

² *Nová mysl*, No. 6, 1968, p. 687.

³ *Ibid.*

historical conditions; it was "pure democracy" or "democracy on a humane basis". This was precisely Masaryk's conception—abstract democracy, "democracy for all mankind", but not class democracy.

Let us compare this with the Marxist conception as presented by Lenin, for example, in his *Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*.

Lenin pointed out that this question "really stands as follows.

"If we are not to mock at common sense and history, it is obvious that we cannot speak of 'pure democracy' as long as different *classes exist*; we can only speak of *class* democracy. (Let us say in parenthesis that 'pure democracy' is not only an *ignorant* phrase, revealing a lack of understanding both of the class struggle and of the nature of the state, but also a thrice-empty phrase, since in communist society democracy will *wither away* in the process of changing and becoming a habit, but will never be 'pure' democracy.)

"'Pure democracy' is the mendacious phrase of a liberal who wants to fool the workers. History knows of bourgeois democracy which takes the place of feudalism, and of proletarian democracy which takes the place of bourgeois democracy."¹

A comparison of the positions of Masarykism and Marxism brings out clearly the fundamental difference between the two ideologies in their understanding and definition of democracy. Can "pure democracy" be defended under present-day conditions? Janeček tried to do this.

During the events of 1968, Right-wing, anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia asserted that Masarykist democracy was "real democracy", that it was better than that which had triumphed in new Czechoslovakia in 1948. Experience showed, however, that that "real democracy" did not suit the working class and peasantry of the First Republic, which is why they fought for proletarian democracy—a democracy

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 242.

which, as Lenin emphasised, is "*a million times more democratic than any bourgeois democracy*" and "to fail to see this one must either deliberately serve the bourgeoisie, or be politically as dead as a doornail, unable to see real life from behind the dusty pages of bourgeois books, be thoroughly imbued with bourgeois-democratic prejudices, and thereby objectively convert oneself into a lackey of the bourgeoisie".¹

Ideological subversion went primarily along the lines of falsifying the Marxist-Leninist understanding of democracy, of falsifying the essence of socialist democracy and its implementation in a society where socialism had triumphed, and of nurturing a cult of the First Republic's democracy. All this involved a rejection of the established political structure of the socialist society and rejection of the leading role of the Communist Party.

At a conference held in March 1971 on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the CPCz, First Secretary of the CC of the Communist Party of Slovakia Lenárt noted that "we recently witnessed how Right-wing opportunists borrowed the arguments of the defeated bourgeois politicians and began to laud so-called Masarykist democracy, lavishing praise on the 'golden age' of the pre-Munich republic and its democracy".²

Masaryk's followers wrote and spoke a lot about Masaryk, the "humanist" and "democrat", but they wrote and said nothing about how the first President treated workers during economic crises, i.e., what that Masarykist democracy was like in practice.

Czechoslovak anti-socialist and Right-wing opportunist ideologists, garbed as defenders of socialism and praising Masaryk to the skies, were pulling the society backwards—back to the first, that is, bourgeois, republic and to the restoration of capitalism.

The cult of Masarykist democracy was countered by Marx-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 248.

² *Czechoslovak News Agency*, Prague, March 1, 1971.

ist-Leninist criticism, which revealed the bourgeois and anti-popular nature of that democracy. An example was Miroslav Šolc's article "Don't Touch Our Masaryk!", which appeared in *Rudé právo* on August 11, 1970, in response to anonymous letters on this theme received by the newspaper. Šolc's article was prefaced with an excerpt from one such letter, which stated: "...how could I remain among traitors and listen to invectives against Masaryk and others who wanted to free the people from cruelty, falsehood, sadism and immorality?"

Since the letter was anonymous, Šolc immediately drew attention to the fact that the ideas expressed in it were identical with those of Ludvík Vaculík, a present-day admirer of Masaryk who had written an article called "The Process of Renaissance in Semil" for the newspaper *Literární listy* (No. 18, 1968) in which he criticised Communists for "attacking the First Republic and Masaryk in a traditional manner".

"I don't want to abuse Masaryk," Šolc replied, "or to ascribe to him anything that does not correspond to the truth. I am quite aware, and I consider this to be correct, that Masaryk cannot be scratched from the history of our people", since he was "an outstanding proponent of late 19th and early 20th century Czech non-Marxist philosophy, sociology and political thought. He was an outstanding bourgeois politician and statesman. Between 1918 and 1934, when he was President of the Czechoslovak Republic, he was one of the pillars of the bourgeois regime. We recognise his positive features and criticise the negative aspects of his activity. I would not want to see the bourgeois republic—whose president Masaryk was for 16 years (out of the 20 years of its existence)—idealised. The disintegration of Austria-Hungary and the emergence of an independent bourgeois republic were important events for our people. The Slovaks were preserved as a nation and both our nationalities gained independence. Nonetheless, that republic should not be idealised. It was a bourgeois republic with all of the negative aspects inherent in it."

Šolc pointed out just what the "negative aspects" of the Masarykist republic consisted of. First of all, there was unemployment. The article cited convincing statistics on this scourge of capitalism. Šolc described the hunger of the unemployed and the poverty of the people.

Furthermore, Šolc pointed out that in the course of the so-called renaissance, the humanism and democracy of Masaryk's republic were often stressed as arguments. Indeed, in certain respects democracy was developed further in Czechoslovakia than in some other countries. However, it was bourgeois democracy with all of its anti-popular substance. When the workers demanded a better life for the working people "the bourgeois government answered with gunfire: Duchov, Frývaldov, Praha, Košuty, Krompachy, Most, Paríkaň, Oslavaně, Polomka, Radotín, Košice, Margecany, Hlohovec—these were some of the places where the blood of workers flowed. Seventy men were killed and over 250 seriously wounded during strikes, demonstrations and police arrests." In the sphere of culture, the First Republic could not cope even with the problem of abolishing illiteracy. In 1936, the illiteracy rate in Czechoslovakia (excluding Western Ukraine) was 28.4 per 1,000 population, while in Slovakia it was 81.6.

Šolc concluded his article with the following words: "These facts show how Masaryk and others wanted to free the people from cruelty, falsehood, sadism and immorality."

The question arises: Why did the myth about Masarykist democracy prove to be so durable? What accounted for the continued influence of Masarykism under the new historical conditions?

There was, of course, a whole complex of external and internal causes, and it is our purpose to examine it in the following pages.

At this point, however, we should say something, at least in a general way, about how these causes differed in character and significance.

Unquestionably, ideological, political and socio-economic

factors all played their role here. As concerns the basic tendencies in the revival of Masarykism, we wish above all to discuss the ideological factors, including the question of the influence of traditions on the minds of men. Masarykism—which represented a whole historical period, and a period connected, moreover, in a certain sense with national upsurge—held sway in people's minds and was implanted and reproduced on a nation-wide scale, as a result of which it acquired the strength of tradition not only among the petty-bourgeois segments and among certain circles of the intelligentsia, but also within the working-class milieu.

All this naturally affected the ideological orientation of the National Front's non-proletarian parties, which had previously adhered essentially to the Masarykist ideology, never having broken with it in principle.

For example, Masarykism determined the political line of the National Socialist Party during the pre-Munich period.

We cite the following data in this connection. On July 26, 1953, the Czechoslovak Socialist Party's newspaper *Svobodné slovo* published an article by A. Vandrovec, in which the author gave the following quote from a speech made by General Secretary of the Czechoslovak Socialist Party M. Klinger: "Members of the National Socialist Party who were attracted to Masaryk's personality sat at the same table in the coalition governments of the pre-Munich republic with representatives of Czechoslovak and international capital. It was above all *Masarykist ideology* that underlay our reformism and our subservience to the bourgeoisie, with which we allowed ourselves to be connected not only through all the diverse bonds of capitalist economics, but also in a political sense [emphasis added—M.S.]" Vandrovec himself added: "The National Socialist Party of that time frequently based its actions and its policy on views drawn from Masaryk's work *The Social Question*", in which Masaryk expressed the "completely unscientific and false view that 'Marx was obsolete and that his theory belongs to the past'", and in which Masaryk, "instead of explaining Marx's theory was concerned

more with obfuscating it, primarily so that the working class would not believe in its historically predetermined role and would not try to assume that role, remaining passively content with philanthropic bourgeois measures which Masaryk, being an idealist and a religiously inclined humanist, demanded that employers undertake with respect to their workers".

Thus, in some of the non-proletarian parties the vestiges of bourgeois ideology had not been adequately overcome.

The events of 1968 showed that the leaders of the non-proletarian parties kept silent about the reactionary essence of Masarykism, but it was important for them to use Masaryk as a "national leader of democracy", a leader of "Czech humanism".

The group of causes just examined, which were connected with the difficulties of overcoming conservative traditions, cannot, in our view, by themselves account for the unprecedented revival of Masarykism under historical conditions when, it seemed, it was least expected, since in the course of building socialism the social roots of Masarykism and, consequently, of its traditions, had been severed.

Under such conditions, conservative traditions cannot be the direct cause of their own revival.

The real causes of the revival of Masarykism can be determined only through a concrete analysis of the specific socio-political and ideological situation prevailing in Czechoslovakia at the time.

Such an analysis shows in particular that Masarykism had in Czechoslovakia a better chance of survival than did any other variety of bourgeois ideology in any other socialist country.

It turned out that many of Masaryk's basic theoretical concepts remained essentially untouched by Marxist criticism right up to the very recent past.

The situation was such that it could hardly be said that Marxism-Leninism held undivided sway in the ideological life of the Czechoslovak socialist society.

For this reason, in our view, Secretary of the CC CPCz Jan Fojtík was right when in an article, "The Situation in the Sphere of the Social Sciences and Their Tasks After the 14th Congress of the CPCz", he wrote: "Needless to say, neither should we ignore the fact that recently among us Marxist-Leninist philosophy was directly countervailed by bourgeois philosophy, that there were attempts to rehabilitate the philosophical approach that is characteristic of Masarykism or other bourgeois trends in philosophy."¹

Apparently, one of the main reasons for the revival of Masarykism in Czechoslovakia was the underestimation in the CPCz of Lenin's proposition that the slightest weakening of socialist ideology only reinforces bourgeois ideology. The CPCz leadership underestimated the danger of Masarykism, its actual and potential strength, and failed to make a scientific study of the real situation on the ideological front along these lines. As a consequence, the theoretical concepts of Masarykism were not subjected to timely and comprehensive criticism; the ideas of Masarykism were given favourable opportunities for revival and spread, thus contributing to the ideological disorientation of definite segments of the population.

It was no accident, then, that the advocates of Masarykism gained strength and were able, against the general background of the inroads being made by bourgeois ideology, to launch a revisionist offensive primarily in philosophy, which was called upon to work out the foundations of the entire ideological and intellectual life of the socialist society.

The fact that the events in Czechoslovakia began with revisionist activity in the sphere of Marxist-Leninist philosophy throws important light on the whole mechanism of subsequent developments.

Therefore, the question of who started the attacks against socialism in Czechoslovakia is as essentially important for

¹ *Rudé právo*, July 1, 1971.

an understanding of the causes of the situation as a whole, as are the sequence and overall picture of the events themselves.

Jan Fojtík gave a good answer to this question in the above-mentioned article: "The first signal of opposition to the working class, the Communist Party and socialism was unquestionably the attack upon Marxist-Leninist ideology in the late 1950s. At that time, Kosík and Sviták and then a number of other writers came out in *Literární noviny*, and later in other organs, describing Marxist-Leninist ideology as 'false consciousness' and as a 'short-lived myth'." Noting that philosophical revisionism became the initiator of a general revisionist offensive and that it contributed nothing original and merely superimposed the views of international revisionism onto Czechoslovak conditions, Fojtík continued: "Today when we can trace the evolution of Kosík's and Sviták's views, when we see what the end results were and what their idols, the various Fischers and Garaudys, came to, we fully understand all the behind-the-scenes aspects of the revisionist deformation of the question of the relationship between science and ideology, the primacy of science over ideology.... Behind all this was the desire to belittle the revolutionary gains of the CPSU and the Soviet people; to depreciate the stage in the development of the communist movement from the time of the October Revolution to the present; to cast doubt on the historical validity of this path and on the principles which underlay and underlie the activity of Leninist Communist parties...."

Fojtík stressed that "in philosophy, revisionism was oriented towards the ultimate destruction of the revolutionary nucleus of Marxism-Leninism—dialectical and historical materialism".

It should be borne in mind above all that one of the results of the cult of Masarykism that had prevailed earlier was that Marxism in Czechoslovakia was perceived among large segments of the intelligentsia and working class through the prism of Masarykism, which had declared that

revolutionary Marxism had been overcome and that in the final count Marx and Engels had themselves repudiated it as an ideal of their youth. Masarykism deliberately introduced confusion into the appraisal of the essence of the two irreconcilable world outlooks, thus making it easier to substitute Masarykism for Marxism and giving rise to a formal and superficial attitude towards the study of Marxist-Leninist science.

Zdeněk Nejedlý wrote in this regard: "Nowhere, it seems, has there been among philosophers such ignorance in the sphere of knowing Marxism as in our country."¹

After being worked over by Masaryk, Marxist philosophy was so distorted that ultimately, in the 1960s, the revisionists placed it in direct dependence on the traditions of Masarykism, positivism, phenomenology and structuralism.² Furthermore, under the cover of the "open Marxism" idea, neopositivism, existentialism, neo-Thomism, neo-Hegelianism and other contemporary idealist and religious currents were also injected into Marxism.

Let us examine some concrete material which will enable us to trace the reasons why the revisionists revived Masarykism and to reveal their "technique" in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism using the methods and flying the flag of Masaryk.

In his book, *Masaryk—the Philosopher of Humanism and Democracy*, J. Král wrote that "Masaryk created the first type, the first specimen, of modern Czech national thought which can be followed and which can be further developed as a whole. The development of our thinking testifies to the fact that Czech thought already follows Masaryk, from the very beginning developing certain aspects of his philosophy."³

What this "whole" was, which Král said ought to be devel-

¹ Zd. Nejedlý, "Slovo o české filosofii", *Úar*, No. 1, March 19, 1950, p. 14.

² See J. Zumr, "Československá filosofie přítomnosti", *Filosofický časopis*, No. 4, 1969, pp. 417-27.

³ J. Král, *Masaryk, filosof humanity a demokracie*, Praha, 1947, p. 31.

oped, can be clearly seen from the definition of Masaryk's philosophy given by its follower F. Krejčí, one of the more prominent bourgeois philosophers of Czechoslovakia and a leading exponent of positivism, whose ideas took shape during the time of Masaryk's activity and under the direct influence of his philosophy: "In his philosophy Masaryk accepts the positivist position, with the unknowability of the transcendental by the intellect that follows from it; however, he supplements scientific knowledge with sensory and intuitive knowledge in order to round out the view of the world with the notion of God and personal immortality."¹

Masaryk himself said: "I am not a materialist, nor a monist, nor a pantheist, nor a dualist; I am a pluralist. Everything (totality) is for me a harmonious system."²

According to Karel Čapek, Masaryk's pluralism "takes in, besides the material world, also the spiritual world, the inner world of the individual consciousness and the consciousness of countless individuals; it takes in the world of the soul; it takes in God".³

And it was this view of the world which was "rounded out" to theism, that is, which was the exact opposite of science and incompatible with it, that Král characterised as a view that was "consistent", "sublime", "a guide to the future", a national Czech and universal "democratic world view", answering "in principle the main problems of life and science in accordance with the contemporary state of scientific thought..."⁴.

Král himself revealed the eclectic essence of Masaryk's philosophy:

"In his noetics Masaryk proceeds from Hume and from English empiricism in general, but, objecting to them, he stresses—and in this, perhaps, one can find above all the influence of Kant—the great creative power of the human spir-

¹ F. Krejčí, *Filosofie posledních let před válkou*, Praha, 1930, p. 259.

² K. Čapek, *Hovory s T.G.M.*, 1946, p. 130.

³ J. Král, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

it. Nonetheless, he stays within the framework of positivism, holding the point of view of moderate relativism and even, I think, agnosticism."¹

The "indefiniteness" of Masaryk's gnoseological position was obvious.

In an effort to define that position, Král wrote: "In accordance with his synergism Masaryk explains our knowledge as the interaction of subject and object. He himself defines his point of view as moderate rationalism or subjectivism (he could have defined it as objectivism with just as good grounds), or ... as concretism..."²

Here are a few concrete examples showing the connection between Masarykist revisionism and the new revisionism during the critical events in Czechoslovakia.

Subscribing to Masaryk's philosophical revisionism, M. Machovec wrote: "For anthropologically oriented Marxism, Masaryk naturally becomes one of the most interesting and inspiring figures in Czech history..."³

The new revisionists established a spiritual kinship between Masaryk and existentialism and declared him to be an "existentialist" critic of Marxism who wished to comprehend the "totality of man" and who revived the "ancient understanding of politics" which included all the other problems common to the whole of mankind.

In his review of Machovec's book, V. Vrabec emphasised that "in many respects Masaryk anticipated the problems and positions of 20th-century existentialist and anthropological philosophy".⁴

O. Loužilová, in an article, "The Problem of the Individual in T. G. Masaryk's Philosophy", spoke of Masaryk's fundamental significance for anthropological-existentialist trends in modern philosophy. She pointed to Masaryk's spe-

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., pp. 9-10.

³ M. Machovec, *Tomáš G. Masaryk*, Praha, 1968, p. 54.

⁴ V. Vrabec, "Počátek kritického hodnocení", *Rudé právo*, May 3, 1968, p. 6.

cial role in the transformation of the very subject of philosophy, his role in the transition "from understanding philosophy as a system of objective truths to recognising it as the creative work and vital expression of the human potentialities of the philosopher himself",¹ to recognising it as the science of man and of his moral improvement, with which Masaryk identified social progress.

Machovec found the essence of the anthropological-existentialist trend in Czechoslovak philosophy to be that it always placed inner life, "the living human personality above all points of view, positions and knowledge of the Aristotelian type".²

This, then, was how the revisionists replaced the subject of Marxist philosophy, how they substituted for Marxist philosophy the Masarykist "philosophy of man", the problems of the "justification" of human existence independent of any particular philosophical or political positions.³

The revisionists in Czechoslovakia contributed nothing to any of the basic problems of philosophy, theory and practice which they dealt with; essentially, they operated with the "fundamentals" of Masarykism, repeating Masaryk's concepts and arguments and combining them with current bourgeois ideological trends. This was a manifestation of the spiritual poverty of revisionism. At the same time, it makes it imperative to investigate Masarykism as the gnoseological source of present-day revisionism in Czechoslovakia, as well as the source of some concepts of international revisionism and anti-communism, which "renovate" their arguments using Masarykism and its later-day followers.

It should be said, however, that the revision of the philosophical foundations of Marxism had a baneful effect on the whole ideological situation in Czechoslovakia. It was largely responsible for the fact that in the 1960s, under the flag of

¹ O. Loužilová, "Problém osobnosti v masarykové filosofii člověka", *Filosofický časopis*, No. 6, 1968, p. 852.

² M. Machovec, op. cit., p. 152.

³ Ibid., p. 148.

the "renaissance" of creative Marxism, there actually took place a process of substituting Masarykism for Marxism, that under the flag of Marxism an eclectic system characteristic of Masarykism and its structure was developing and being renewed; it finally became embodied in an overall eclectic synthesis of Masarykism and the basic modern trends in bourgeois philosophy and international revisionism.¹

It was on this basis that there took place in the 1968-1969 period a direct capitulation to bourgeois ideology, reaching a point where the basic principles of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook in philosophy, sociology, history, economics, in the theory of the state and law, the building of the Party, and also in the sphere of culture and art, were categorically discarded and rejected.²

As the facts cited show, the efforts of the revisionists in Czechoslovakia were directed not towards the revival of "authentic", creative Marxism, not towards the revival of "true, Marxist socialism", but towards the revival of Masarykism, which was hostile to Marxism and socialism and which in its modernised form they used as the basis for designing a "new", "national", "Czechoslovak" model of socialism.

2. "THE CZECHOSLOVAK MODEL OF SOCIALISM"— THE EMBODIMENT OF MASARYKISM

Bourgeois ideologists and revisionists of all trends focus their attention today on downgrading real socialism. They seek, on the one hand, to discredit the practice of socialism—which represents a new socio-economic formation—to the point of "denying" that socialism really exists in the socialist countries, and on the other, to distort and undermine the theory of scientific socialism, to drown the strictly scientific Marxist-Leninist definition and understanding of socialism

¹ During those years many monographs were published in Czechoslovakia devoted to various aspects of Masaryk's activity.

² See *Poučení z krizového vývoje*, p. 28.

in a torrent of pseudoscientific concepts, to cancel out the scientific criteria of socialist society. The requirements of accomplishing this task gave rise to a new and special trend in anti-communism, namely, that of fabricating a multitude of theories and models of socialism with the aim of weakening the revolutionising influence that is being exerted on the minds of people everywhere by the real socialism that has been built in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries. The objective is to conceal from the world public the fundamental advantages of socialism, which is now firmly established and ascendant, over declining capitalism.

The Programme of the CPSU stressed the world historical significance of the complete and final victory of socialism in the USSR:

"As a result of the devoted labour of the Soviet people and the theoretical and practical activities of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, *there exists in the world a socialist society that is a reality and a science of socialist construction that has been tested in practice. The highroad to socialism has been paved.* Many peoples are already marching along it..."¹

It is precisely this basic fact and its growing social consequences that the anti-communists and revisionists wish to conceal from mankind, to pluck from the consciousness of peoples.

Analysis of the ideological and political situation in Czechoslovakia shows that by themselves and relying only on their own forces the revisionists could not have shaken the social order, could not have gone any farther than demagogic criticism of one or another aspect of the theory and practice of socialism.

Therefore, imperialism's anti-communist centres had long been preoccupied with the idea of creating an "historical" precedent for the practical embodiment of the basic concepts of anti-communism and revisionism aimed at destroying

¹ *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1961, p. 463.

socialism in at least one country. Socialist Czechoslovakia was chosen for this "experiment".

In line with this, the anti-communist centres of imperialism worked out an alternative to the socialism that had been established in Czechoslovakia, in the form of a "national Czechoslovak model of socialism". This model was opposed above all to the "Soviet model of socialism", with the aim of undermining the unity of the socialist countries.

Imperialism thus adopted a course aimed at breaking up socialism and the world communist movement from within with the help of ideological subversion and other means designed to change the meaning and content of the basic values of socialism through its "liberalisation" in the spirit of "democratic socialism".

Such exactly was the concept of one of the main preachers of anti-communism, Zbigniew Brzezinski, who hastened to Prague with a lecture on "The End of Leninism" as soon as developments in Czechoslovakia began to go the way imperialism wanted.

Jaromír Obzina, in an article entitled "The Behests of Engels and the Roots of Czechoslovak Anti-Communism",¹ pointed out that the revival of the Masarykist model of socialism was stimulated from the outside. As an example, he cited a work by Gordon Skilling, director of the Centre for the Study of Russia and Eastern Europe at the University of Toronto, called "Communism and the Czechoslovak Tradition" (1966), in which it was asserted that under Masaryk's leadership a new, socialist state, unacceptable, however, to the Communists, had been built in Czechoslovakia before the war. Skilling called on the anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia who stood for the complete or partial rehabilitation of the ideas of Masaryk and Beneš, which were the antithesis of communist ideals and ideology, to begin on this basis to create the Czechoslovak theory of national socialism.

J. Cvekl, who had taken a revisionist position during the

¹ See *Život strany*, No. 20, 1970.

events of 1968-1969, later stated self-critically that the new model of "socialism" which the revisionists in Czechoslovakia were trying to pass off as a creative contribution to Marxism, was not something they themselves worked out, but that "it was created by the anti-communist headquarters of the imperialist countries".¹

It was not accidental, therefore, that that particular model was elevated to the rank of a world event, and that anti-communism assigned it a kind of "messianic" role on our planet,² a role that was particularly exaggerated by such "idols" of the Czechoslovak revisionists as Roger Garaudy and Ernst Fischer, who had devoted special works and speeches, including some right in Prague, to prepare for the "Prague Spring" and the "Czechoslovak experiment".

Responding sympathetically to "the Czechs' polemic with Marxism", Garaudy "worked" primarily to give the whole "Czechoslovak experiment" an anti-Soviet orientation, using the specific features of Czechoslovakia as a screen.

The events of 1968-1969 in Czechoslovakia underlined with fresh force the danger of underestimating nationalism and the inadmissibility of any relaxation in the theoretical work of the Communist parties. That work, which involves making a scientific analysis of the situation, is designed to prevent in good time any undesirable developments and to point to the ways of averting any maturing dangers and conflicts.

Several leading sectors of the theoretical front in Czechoslovakia turned out, however, to have succumbed to the bourgeois theory of a plurality of models of socialism. Instead of working on a programme for the further development of already victorious socialism, many social scientists embarked on the road of its total criticism and rejection, on the road of devising a "Czechoslovak model of socialism" to be promoted under the sign of the "creative development"

¹ J. Cvekl, "Problém 'modelu socialismu' a marxismus", *Nová mysl*, No. 8, 1970, p. 1100.

² G. Husák, "The Leninist Teaching on the Party and Czechoslovak Reality", *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, Russ. ed., No. 1, 1970, p. 8.

of Marxism and the search for "new" ways of socialist progress.

In his address at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969, Gustav Husák said: "The content of socialism and its basic principles became an object of ideological and political speculation. Some associated the concept of socialism with pluralist bourgeois democracy and the reformist model of so-called democratic socialism from the programmes of Right Social-Democratic parties."¹

It is fitting at this point to recall that at the most critical moment during the events in Czechoslovakia, *Rudé právo*, which had fallen temporarily under the influence of the anti-socialist and Rightist forces, in its issues of July 10, 11 and 12, 1968, published those forces' "programme" article under the title of "On the Eve of Adopting the Decision (On the New Czechoslovak Model of Socialism)". That article called real socialism "an empty word", and the Soviet Union "the main enemy".

The revisionist "Czechoslovak model of socialism" was not only calculated to distort the prospects of the development of socialism in Czechoslovakia, but had itself grown out of false appraisals of the history of the struggle for socialism, of the building of socialism, and the stage it had reached, and out of fallacious assessments of "Masarykist democracy" and "Masarykist socialism".

It was this model of distorted socialism that was advanced as an alternative to real socialism.

Historically, priority in designing the "Czechoslovak model of socialism", which was subsequently revived by the revisionists at the initiative of anti-communism, belongs to T. G. Masaryk. He had developed the revisionist concept of "humane, democratic socialism" which, on the one hand, was identified essentially with the bourgeois-democratic Czechoslovak republic, and on the other, was opposed as a sup-

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 408.*

posedly genuine, "Marxist" socialism to the real socialism in the USSR.

Already in Masaryk's time, the leading slogan, calculated to deceive the masses, was "Socialism—yes, but our own, democratic and Czechoslovak socialism!"

What this "socialism" looked like in practice was described by L. Hrzal, who wrote in an article entitled "A Critique of 'Democratic Socialism' in Czechoslovakia" that Communists of the older generation "well remembered how formerly, under the bourgeois system, anti-communist attacks had frequently been organised under the slogan of Masarykist 'democratic socialism' ".¹

Later, during the development of the people's democratic revolution in Czechoslovakia, the Right-wing Social-Democratic theorists persistently tried to impose the Masarykist model of socialism on public opinion. For example, J. Görlich wrote: "Masaryk and Masaryk's spirit still show us the path today. If we follow this path and remain faithful to his behest, we can again, as in the period of the Reformation, make a big contribution in the interests of mankind and create a new type of democratic socialism which will be the result of Western European democratic tradition and the experience of the Russian social revolution and socialist construction."²

And this goal was put on the agenda by other parties as well. As Jaromír Obzina wrote, the leadership of the Czechoslovak Socialist Party, continuing the traditions of the National Socialist Party, proclaimed in 1968 "the political rehabilitation of Masarykism as its key political perspective",³ with the aim of achieving in "our society humane democracy and socialism in the spirit of Masaryk".⁴

¹ *Contemporary Right-Wing Revisionism. A Critical Analysis*. Joint publication of Mysl Publishers, Moscow, and Svoboda Publishers, Prague, Moscow, 1973, p. 490 (in Russian).

² J. Görlich, *Masaryk a dnešek*, Praha, 1947, p. 12.

³ Jaromír Obzina, *K leninskému pojetí politiky*, Praha, 1971, p. 100.

⁴ "Prohlášení bývalých členu Čs. strany národně socialistické", *Svobodné slovo*, July 2, 1968.

In M. Machovec's book, *Tomáš G. Masaryk*, which was published in two editions in 1968, the preface to the second edition said that "Masaryk again—thirty years after his death—becomes the symbol of Czech and Slovak national and state freedom, of our statehood, originality and distinctiveness".¹

In that book Machovec lauded Masaryk's political revisionism and called Masaryk "a classic of democracy" who understood democracy both as a political form of the life of society and as the substance of human life.² He also declared the Czechoslovak Communists' programme to be "Masaryk's programme".³

Machovec defined the meaning of the whole Czechoslovak "experiment of 1968" as the creation of a new model of socialism based on a "synthesis of Marx and Masaryk".⁴

In this connection the "Czechoslovak model of socialism" was treated as the embodiment of the "national variant of Marxism", when underlying it in fact was Masarykism disguised in Marxist plumage, that is, a revisionist distortion of Marxism.

In an article entitled "The Essence and Function of Contemporary Philosophical Revisionism in Czechoslovakia", A. K. Netopilik emphasised this point: "The national variant of Marxism was an attempt not only to synthesise Marxism with Masarykism, anti-socialist bourgeois ideology and other bourgeois philosophical trends in prewar Czechoslovakia, such as, for example, positivism, phenomenology, pragmatism and structuralism, but also to wage a struggle against Leninism as 'Russified' Marxism. . . . It is not hard to see that it was not a question of a new Marxism, but of its revision in the spirit of the bourgeois philosophical traditions of pre-Munich Czechoslovakia."⁵

¹ M. Machovec, *Tomáš G. Masaryk*, Praha, 1968, p. 9.

² Ibid., p. 12.

³ Ibid., p. 88.

⁴ Ibid., p. 9.

⁵ *Contemporary Right-Wing Revisionism. A Critical Analysis*, p. 486.

The opposing of Leninism to "authentic" Marxism reached the point, with Kosík, for example, of completely ignoring the Leninist stage. In his works Kosík cited only Marx. Of course, all talk about a "synthesis" of Masarykism and Marxism was only a screen to conceal the fact that, on the whole, the "new Czechoslovak model of socialism" was the old revisionist model of "humane" socialism, which was designed by Masaryk not for "synthesis" with Marxism, but for struggle against it.

Vasil Bil'ak pointed out that the attempt to tie to the concept of socialism such attributes as national, democratic, Christian or humane is an erroneous and non-Marxist approach, for "the socialist system is in itself the most humane and contains the maximum of humaneness. The revisionists need such epithets only to deceive people..."¹

The general revisionist framework of the "new" model of socialism was identical with that of its Masarykist prototype: it was an attempt to substitute "Christ for Marx and Masaryk for Lenin".²

If there was anything "new" in this "new" model, it was its anti-communism and anti-Sovietism taken to the extreme, and its cult of Masarykist "socialism". Vasil Bil'ak stresses that the new revisionists whipped up "anti-Soviet hysteria and even on a larger scale than they had succeeded in doing during Masaryk's republic..."³; they "glorified Masaryk, Beneš, Štefaník, and in a form which even the pre-Munich republic would not have agreed to".⁴

The revisionist essence of the Masarykist model of "socialism" stands fully exposed in the following words of revisionist K. Kosík, who concretised, as it were, the Masarykist thesis that "the meaning of Czech history is humaneness": "Humane socialism proceeds from other foundations than

¹ Vasil Bil'ak, *Pravda zostala pravdou*, p. 179.

² Ibid., p. 372.

³ Ibid., p. 282.

⁴ Ibid., p. 364.

does bureaucratic socialism ... the two have different conceptions of history, man, truth, etc."¹

As we can see, the model in question was perceived by the revisionists themselves as the direct opposite of real socialism, as its full replacement by bourgeois concepts of socialism, which pass off capitalism, prettied up with humanistic phraseology, as socialism.

Revisionism declared a "profound" crisis not only of socialism in Czechoslovakia, but of socialism as a whole, as a social formation, since complete inconsistency between Marxist theory and socialist practice had allegedly been revealed (Masaryk spoke in the same vein in his article, "Revolution and the Bolsheviks").

In a series of articles that Kosík wrote under the common heading "Our Present Crisis" (in repeating the title of one of Masaryk's works, Kosík stressed his spiritual unity with Masaryk), he was already preaching the "crisis" of socialism in Czechoslovakia through the titles of these articles themselves: "The Crisis of the Political System: Party Members and Non-Party Members", "The Crisis of the Political Individual"; "The Crisis of Classes and Society"; "The Crisis of Nations"; "The Crisis of Authority"; "The Crisis of Socialism".²

Real socialism was denigrated by the revisionists as a society that was "inhumane in its very essence" (L. Vaculík), as a "police-bureaucratic dictatorship", as "illusory" socialism, as a system of "general irresponsibility", "general mystification" and "mass false consciousness", in which decisions are made in "the absence of any conception of reason", as a system in which the alienation of man is just as inherent as it is in capitalism, with the only difference that in the first case it stems from totalitarian bureaucratism, while in the second from private property and the exploitation of man by man.

¹ K. Kosík, *Dialektika konkrétního*, p. 88.

² See K. Kosík, "Naše nynější krize", *Literární listy*, Nos. 7-12, 1968.

The blanket criticism of socialism was built on absolutising and artificially ballooning the objective and subjective difficulties and shortcomings of the actual building of socialism and ignoring their historically transient character. The 14th Congress of the CPCz stressed that the Right-wing and anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia had abused the self-criticism of the Party and set out to denigrate its entire history, the entire period of building socialism; they had taken the path of negativism.

In the economic sphere, the "Czechoslovak model of socialism" envisaged the abolition of public socialist ownership of the implements and means of production and of centralised state economic planning, and the separation of the economy from the state—that is, the elimination of the fundamental advantages of the socialist economy which ensure steady economic growth and a rising standard of living.

Under the pretext of creating new, Czechoslovakia's "own", economy of socialism, her "own" economic "mechanism of self-development", the anti-socialist forces recommended a system of universal free enterprise based on the reinstatement of private and group property, a system of enterprise self-management, and a system of free market regulation of economic effectiveness, all of which, in sum, could mean nothing other than the inevitable re-establishment of capitalism.

At the same time it was stressed that "the new economic model of socialism is inviable without a new political model of democratic socialism, and vice versa".¹

In the political sphere, the model envisaged the abolition of the leading role of the working class and the CPCz; the elimination of the CPCz as a party of the new type; allowing intra-Party opposition in it; its repudiation of the principles of democratic centralism; its gradual dismantling—its break-up into separate national, regional and production autonomous organisations; the separation of the CPCz from the

¹ "Zpráva o zasedání válného shromáždění ČSE". *Bulletin Československá společnost ekonomická při ČSAU. Slovenská ekonomická spoločnosť při SAU*, No. 3, 1968, p. 5.

mechanism of state power; the gradual curtailment of the political and economic functions of the socialist state; the disbandment of organs protecting law and order, and the abolition of all state regulation and control of public actions.

Under the cover of misleading Masarykist slogans about abstract humanism—"pure democracy", "absolute freedom", "universal love of one's neighbour", "absolute equality"—and also of a new hypocritical slogan about "the Party's humane mission",¹ a political system was recommended that would function "on the basis of partnership, competition of ideas and people, confrontations and opponency",² on the basis of numerous political parties whose common programme would be "democratic socialism". However, since this unprincipled multi-party system did not exclude a "partnership" of bourgeois and anti-Marxist parties (the Social-Democratic, Christian, and other parties), the goal of this "competition" was obvious: to eliminate the leading role of the CPCz, without which socialism is impossible, without which the society would inevitably slip back to capitalism, and the leading role of the bourgeois parties would inevitably be re-established.

It was proclaimed that the leading role belonged to the intelligentsia, the "spiritual" or "intellectual elite", which was destined to establish "true socialism".

This slogan was used to oppose the intelligentsia to the working class, to discredit the leading role of the working class and its party, to conceal the consolidation and revival of the anti-socialist forces, including the bourgeois parties.

The revisionists proclaimed economic, political and ideological orientation to the West and a course towards the so-called convergence of socialism and capitalism, stressing at the same time that only a "society with a modern orientation"³ could aspire to socialism. By this they meant a Western-type "industrial society", stressing that Czechoslovakia

¹ *Rudé právo*, July 12, 1968, p. 5.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Rudé právo*, July 11, 1968, p. 5.

was just that type. The Soviet Union, they said, as a "backward" country, was unable to cope with the tasks set by the scientific and technological revolution.

On the whole, the "Czechoslovak model of socialism" meant the revival of a model of ordinary capitalism touched up by Masarykism.

In conclusion, it remains to be noted that the great bulk of the people of Czechoslovakia turned out to be the decisive force that rejected the "new model of socialism" and put an end to the counter-revolutionary encroachments of the Right-wing and anti-socialist forces.

As Vasil Bil'ak points up, "hundreds of thousands of ordinary people who were devoted to the Party and the socialist system, people who today, without bragging about anything, modestly continue their work, opposed the anti-socialist forces both by their attitude and their courageous labour and objectively blocked their splitting activity. These loyal people do not demand that it be written in their service records that they were internationalists. They deserve our sincere gratitude for their honest position, for their labour and their support of the cause of socialism."¹

3. THE INTERNATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE LENINIST PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM

One of the reasons it is important to get at the real causes for the revival of Masarykism in 1968-1969 is that it was used by the enemies of socialism as proof that Masarykism was "eternal" and the only possible "national Czech world outlook", reflecting the specific conditions of Czechoslovakia and appropriate to them; it was used to deny that the Leninist conception of socialism was applicable to Czechoslovak conditions.

It is important to get at the real causes also because im-

¹ Vasil Bil'ak, *Pravda zostala pravdou*, pp. 322-23.

perialism's ideological subversion, which went so far as to try to introduce a "new model of socialism" into Czechoslovakia, was designed not only for Czechoslovakia, but for other socialist countries as well, in connection with which international significance was and continues to be attached to the "new" model with a view to its future export as "true socialism" to other socialist countries.

As we can see, the Marxist analysis of the causes of the revival of Masarykism and of the origins of the events in Czechoslovakia themselves is of international significance.

Revealing the fundamental nature of this problem, Gustav Husák said: "Honest people were disoriented not only in our country but far beyond the borders of Czechoslovakia. Therefore we are obliged to strive to overcome the false information and ideas about our internal development and its world interconnections in 1968 and 1969 right up to the present time."¹

The revival of Masarykism was obviously not an isolated and independent process; it can be understood only in its connection with the events of 1968-1969 and in the light of that set of causes that led to the revival and strengthening of Right-wing and anti-socialist forces in the country, which raised Masarykism as their ideological banner.

The CC CPCz attaches great importance to the scientific study of this problem also because without a theoretical analysis, without revealing the causes of the crisis development, it would have been impossible to overcome the consequences of that development or to set the proper guidelines for the further struggle against Masarykism and for completely overcoming its influence.

Gustav Husák frequently stressed that the deformations in the building of socialism and the crisis development in 1968-1969 arose not because the Leninist teaching did not apply to the conditions of Czechoslovakia, but that, on the

¹ Gustav Husák, *Selected Articles and Speeches, October 1969-July 1973*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1973, p. 141.

contrary, they arose because the Leninist principles of building socialism were violated or ignored. Those principles are of universal significance, for "each country builds socialism with account taken of its specific conditions, but there is only one socialism. It is the socialism in which the theoretical legacy of Marx, Engels and Lenin was embodied."¹

A profound and comprehensive creative analysis of the whole complex of conditions and causes of the crisis events is contained in many documents of the CC CPCz and in speeches and articles by Gustav Husák and other Party and Government leaders. This analysis has brought out a number of basic causes of the crisis, and also the conditions and circumstances that were conducive to its development.

The direct cause of the deep political crisis of 1968-1969 was the counter-revolutionary activity of the class forces inside and outside the country that were hostile to socialism, as well as underestimation by the CPCz of the danger of ideological subversion on the part of imperialism, the danger of its efforts to bring about the internal disintegration of socialist states.

The main condition opening up the possibility for the crisis development and the gradually mounting offensive of the forces of counter-revolution was the "deviation from the basic Leninist principles, from the general laws of the building of socialism"² which the former leadership of the CC CPCz made in the 1960s.

However, the deviations that did take place were not inevitably fraught with the subsequent outburst of anti-socialist tendencies; they were not anti-socialist in principle, but by and large reflected difficulties associated with the manifestation of conservative trends in the activity of the former leadership of the CC CPCz in a period when the society faced a new and complex task—the building of developed socialism. Against the background of an increasingly accelerating sci-

¹ Gustav Husák, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

² *Ibid.*, p. 382.

entific and technological revolution and the transition from extensive to intensive development, when old methods of leadership began to impede the solution of urgent socio-economic problems, the former leadership of the Party turned out to be less and less capable of effectively applying Leninism in practice, of solving pressing political and economic problems efficiently and in good time.

Obviously, these stagnant, inert forces that blocked the road to the further progressive development of socialism had to be removed. And they were removed by the forces of the CPCz itself, which at its January 1968 Plenary Meeting of the CC took the following action: removed A. Novotný from the leadership; made a critical re-examination of the preceding period; condemned the errors, deviations and deformations which had been perpetrated during that period and which had led to stagnation in all spheres of life, lowered the prestige of the CPCz and weakened its leading role; outlined ways to achieve economic, social and cultural successes on the basis of returning to the Leninist style of work and observing the Leninist principles of building socialism.

As we can see, the above-mentioned errors in themselves were not fraught with the inevitable consequence of dangerous development. The key factor in the really critical events was the subsequent opportunist policy of A. Dubček. Upon assuming the leadership of the CC CPCz, instead of pursuing the constructive Party line outlined by its 13th Congress and its December (1967) and January (1968) Plenary Meetings of the CC, he encouraged the revisionists in the CPCz, the group that opened the road to imperialism's "fifth column",¹ which had formed long before the crisis events and had the aim of seizing the leading posts of the CPCz and accomplishing a counter-revolutionary coup under the cover of declarations about "improving" socialism. The revisionist, anti-socialist and directly counter-revolutionary forces were given complete freedom of action.

¹ Ibid., pp. 951, 952.

Gustav Husák noted that one of the "determining causes" of the crisis development was the gradual penetration into the Party's leading bodies of people "who increasingly betrayed the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism" and who gradually "gained the upper hand in the Party leadership",¹ paralysing "all the main links of our socialist political system".²

Revealing the class roots and the class content of the ideology and policies of Right-wing opportunism in Czechoslovakia, Gustav Husák stressed their indissoluble connection with international anti-communism, showing that the "democratic socialism" of the Right-wingers was essentially a weapon of anti-communism:

"Alexander Dubček and his supporters were harming the Party and the people by advancing the revisionist concept of so-called 'democratic socialism'.... They continually retreated before the pressure of the counter-revolution and actually cleared the way for it ... sinking even to liquidationism, which took the form of the hostile platform of the notorious anti-Party convention at Vysočany. The attempt was made there to set up a counter-revolutionary headquarters under the Communist Party sign...."³

Pointing out that the activity of the Right-wing opportunists was not "simply an error", Gustav Husák gave the following final class assessment of Right-wing opportunism in Czechoslovakia: "The programme of the Right-wing forces put them in a line with international anti-communism."⁴

It was, consequently, no longer a question of particular deviations from basic Leninist principles and from the general regularities of building socialism, but rather a question of their being discarded altogether, which meant a struggle against the very foundations of socialism in Czechoslovakia.

¹ Gustav Husák, *op. cit.*, p. 436.

² *Ibid.*, p. 437.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 439.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 813.

The attempt to implement the revisionist concept of "democratic socialism" based on the complete rejection of Leninist principles was inevitably leading to chaos, anarchy and the destruction of the basic values of real socialism. The take-over of the CPCz leadership by the Right-wing forces and their alliance with anti-socialist elements disoriented and paralysed many people in the Party and society who were devoted to socialism, and this tilted the balance of forces in favour of counter-revolution. A situation developed in which the CPCz could not stop the counter-revolution by itself; only timely international action by the socialist countries could save socialism in Czechoslovakia.

Analysis of all the circumstances related to the origins of phenomena of stagnation and crisis in the process of building developed socialism in Czechoslovakia, shows that all these deformations were caused by violation of the general laws of the building of socialism, although the class factors underlying specific violations might have been different. Consequently, it was not a matter of the Leninist principles of socialism being inapplicable to the conditions of Czechoslovakia. The trouble was, rather, that no consistent struggle was waged to keep the Leninist principles pure and to bring about their practical embodiment in the life of the Party and the country.

Gustav Husák said the following in this connection: "When our people not only stopped turning to Lenin's legacy, but even began to reject Lenin's ideas, tragedy followed.

"This past period has shown how alive and important is that everyday, modest and oft-repeated Leninist truth about the building of socialism. And this same period has shown that not a single phrase about a 'new model' of socialism and its 'progressive' variants can stifle or replace that truth."¹

The basis of the proper functioning and development of socialism is observation of Leninist principles; the basis of coming out of a crisis situation that arises as a result of their

¹ Ibid., p. 126.

rejection is restoration of Leninist principles in full—such is the lesson of the events in Czechoslovakia.

Underlining the crucial significance of the Leninist principles for the solution of all the problems of socialism both in the national and in the international context, Gustav Husák pointed out: "Faithfulness to the ideas of Leninism and protection of their purity—these are the basic criteria of the correctness of both the home and foreign policies of Communist and Workers' parties.

"The study and solid mastery of Lenin's theoretical legacy are highly important also because while specific features ensuing from the concrete conditions of one or another country building socialism are observed, the general laws of and propositions on the building of socialism apply to the fundamental, crucial questions for all countries."¹

Wherein lies the "secret" of the limitless confidence in the inevitability of the victory of communism on this planet? Why the inevitable decay of the capitalist system and the emergence of the communist system, coming to the fore to replace it? Why was the crisis development halted and overcome and why did Marxism-Leninism again triumph in Czechoslovakia? The answer to all these questions lies in the inviolability of the objective laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Inasmuch as on the ideological plane the events in Czechoslovakia reflected the struggle between Masarykism and Marxism, we shall mainly examine the views of Masaryk on the objective laws governing the development of society.

In *The Social Question*, Masaryk had a section called "Historical Laws and the Theory of Development", in which he "polemised" with Marxism on the concept of the scientific nature of historical and natural laws.

"Marx and Engels," Masaryk wrote, "see the scientific nature of history in the ascertainment of laws as natural laws."²

¹ Gustav Husák, op. cit., p. 105.

² Masaryk, *Otázka sociální*, Vol. I, p. 268.

On this basis, Masaryk falsified the Marxist understanding of law and regularity, ascribing to Marxism the principles of positivism and absolute determination in the actions of individuals and the masses, the principles of naturalism and the subordination of sociology and history to natural science or the history of natural science.¹

Falsifying the propositions of Marx and Engels on the correlation between the general laws of history and the specific regularities of separate socio-economic formations, Masaryk tried to ascribe to Marxism a rejection of general laws and recognition of only specific regularities: "Even if it were true that historical periods differ one from the other as plants differ from animals (and this, of course, is not true), then there would also be certain general laws applicable to all periods; scientific explanation by special laws alone is quite impossible."²

Furthermore, Masaryk ultimately claimed that Marxism was unable to demonstrate the objective nature of laws: "...under closer scrutiny, it turns out that Marx's dialectics is just as subjective as Hegel's."³

Ignoring the thorough and fundamental philosophical and economic substantiation of the theory of scientific communism found in Marxism, Masaryk sought to "dismiss" this substantiation by accusing Marxism of citing, "properly speaking, only one single argument in favour of communism—historical development".⁴

Masaryk needed all these ways of denying that the socio-political conclusions in Marxism were scientific, in order to distort the meaning of the modern era, the content of which is the transition from capitalism to socialism, and to cast doubt on the objective and law-governed character of that transition, to cancel out the objective criteria of the communist socio-economic formation itself, the formation that

¹ Ibid., pp. 268-89.

² Ibid., pp. 272-73.

³ Ibid., pp. 274-75.

⁴ Ibid., Vol. II, p. 24.

follows capitalism with the inevitability of a natural historical process.

Contrary to actual facts, Masaryk asserted that "our time does not at all demand communism with the imperativeness of natural law".¹

The core of Masaryk's criticism of communism was the denial of the economic necessity and the very economic possibility of communism.

In opposition to the Marxist understanding of communist revolution primarily as a fundamental change in economic relations and the establishment of the predominance of public property, Masaryk reiterated: "I reject economic communism"; "Nor do I recognise the demand for economic equality"; "On a purely economic basis, as demanded by historical materialism, communism is impossible"; "Universal economic communism is impossible even in the distant future";² etc.

In order to blot out the basic objective economic law of the present period, namely, the necessity of the transition from private to public property, Masaryk took the road of complete subjectivism and bare pragmatism in his assessment of the forms of property and their historical significance, trying at the same time to distort the real picture and the materialist understanding of the historical process, in which definite forms of property naturally replace each other on the basis of the objective and uninterrupted development of the productive forces.

Masaryk wrote: "I consider neither private nor public property to be sacred. I judge any form of property and its development above all from the standpoint of utility, as a means to an end. And, therefore, in all relations of property I see only historically transitional and transitory forms."³

As we can see, the objective historical process was gone,

¹ Masaryk, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 276.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 22.

³ *Ibid.*

and there remained only "transitional and transitory forms", existing by themselves, and this so that Masaryk could mechanically lump together these forms at will in their various combinations and present this eclectic mixture as socialism.

Aware of the fact that state public property is the decisive advantage of socialism and that it is the basis of centralised planning on a nation-wide scale, Masaryk tried to undermine that advantage, that general and fundamental principle of socialism, by stating: "Nor am I enraptured by economic centralisation; in both politics and economics I stand for self-government and federation. I do not consider state socialism desirable; I would prefer economic management that is independent of the state. I recognise the benefit of competition."¹

It was exactly in this vein that the latter-day revisionists attacked the basic principles and advantages of socialism during the events of 1968-1969.

Masaryk tried to muddle what scientific communism had to say about the two logically successive phases of communist society. He passed off reformed capitalism for socialism, and reduced Marxist communism to "forced centralisation in all spheres of life".²

What was Masaryk's conception of communism? We should note first of all the basic feature of that conception, viz., its extreme subjective-idealist basis which completely ignored and rejected the objective character of the laws and principles of communism, the objective content and criteria of the new social system. Actual communism, according to Masaryk, "is possible only on a moral and religious basis, among friends; but we are all far from a society that is amicably organised on sympathies!"³; "communism is possible only on the scale and on the grounds defined by Aristotle in objecting to Plato—precisely on the basis of friendship..."⁴

¹ Ibid., p. 23.

² Ibid., p. 22.

³ Masaryk, *Světová revoluce*, p. 207.

⁴ Masaryk, *Otázka sociální*, Vol. II, pp. 22-23.

Fearing Marxism, fearing the objective course of modern history, fearing the world communist movement, Masaryk suggested nothing more "scientific" than to throw modern social thought 2,000 years back, essentially to its historical starting point—to ancient Greek philosophy.

Masaryk understood neither the objective causes and driving forces of revolution nor even those revolutionary transformations in which he himself was taking part.

For example, in an interview published by the Prague editor of *Lidové noviny* in the December 24, 1920 issue of that paper, Masaryk explained his view on revolution in Czechoslovakia as follows:

"The necessity for every revolution is ultimately determined by one or several political leaders. . . . Before the war, I had studied the problem of revolution for many years. . . . Through continuous discussions about revolution from a moral point of view (the last time in a book about Russia) I showed that I had correctly assessed the world situation: I expected coups and revolutions and felt that ultimately the question of the necessity for revolution and of the right to it would also be decided by me. And that is what happened. I organised our national struggle and led our revolution (emphasis added—M.S.)."

To demonstrate the unscientific nature of Masaryk's conception of "revolution", let us compare it with the Marxist understanding of revolution.

Speaking at a Moscow Gubernia (Provincial) Conference of Factory Committees in July 1918, Lenin said: "Revolutions are not made to order, they cannot be timed for any particular moment; they mature in a process of historical development and break out at a moment determined by a whole complex of internal and external causes."¹

And here is another of Lenin's important statements about revolution. In an article, "Strange and Monstrous", in which he explained why a resolution of the Moscow Regional Party

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 547.

Bureau was scientifically untenable, he wrote: "Perhaps the authors believe that the interests of the world revolution require that it should be *given a push*, and that such a push can be given only by war, never by peace. . . . Such a 'theory' would be completely at variance with Marxism, for Marxism has always been opposed to 'pushing' revolutions. . . ."¹

Masaryk's concept of revolution—a concept based on the principle that revolution depends on individual leadership, that it is personally organised by someone—cannot stand up under scientific criticism.

Masaryk's denial of general objective laws in historical development meant denying the objective significance of scientific communism, the general laws governing socialist revolution and the emergence and development of a new socio-economic formation; it meant subjectivism and voluntarism in the approach to problems of social development, the problems of socialism and the interpretation of the very essence of socialism and communism. But if there are no general laws governing social development and the building of socialism, then the social process has to do with only one obvious factor—with strictly national characteristics—to which decisive significance is attached.

Hence Masarykism contains arguments for substantiating the break-up of the single international socialist process into "national Marxisms" and "national communisms", each developing according to its own laws, for justifying the existence of numerous national "models" of socialism, opposing one another.

It is on this strategic point that Masarykism closed ranks with the ideology of modern imperialism; and this explains why the latter put its stake on Masarykism, advancing it as the basis for the "Czechoslovak model of socialism".

The work of the bourgeois propaganda machine is aimed primarily at stirring up nationalism in order to bring about a "quiet counter-revolution" in the political and social rela-

¹ Ibid., pp. 71-72.

tions of the socialist countries. The imperialists count on distracting attention from the general laws of socialist construction by fostering a cult of nationalism and of national specificities. Various "theories" are brought in to prove the decisive significance and superiority of a given people's national traditions under the mask of national uniqueness. All this is calculated to facilitate subversive activity against socialism and its basic principles.

The thing that the imperialist-backed anti-socialist forces who were to instigate the conspiracy in Czechoslovakia needed was to find a nationalistic banner, no matter even if it came from the archives of the past era. They needed a nationalist hero—a "Great Czech". And they found him. It is obvious that the roots of the hysterical voluntarism and nationalism indulged in by the Right-wing and anti-socialist forces during the events went back to Masarykism.

The threat to the revolutionary gains of the Czechoslovak people was mounting. As noted in the document, *Lessons of the Crisis Development*, "events after January 1968 confirmed the fact that the Right-wing forces led a deliberate attack against all the basic principles and norms of socialism, systematically demoralising the Party and the entire political socialist system".¹

What are these basic principles and norms of socialism? That is, what general laws in the building of socialism must every Communist Party strictly observe? The document, *Lessons of the Crisis Development*, reflecting the experience of struggle with opportunism during the events of 1968, emphasised the role of general laws as follows:

"The development of the socialist revolution under the conditions of an existing world socialist system has its objective laws and mandatory criteria which, when specific national features are observed, determine the character of socialist rule and make for the systematic revolutionary development of society. Violation of these laws harms the interests of socialism, and if they are ignored and swept away

¹ *Poučení z krizového vývoje*, p. 22.

altogether, such action is in substance anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary."¹

As we said earlier, the Right-wing and anti-socialist forces disregarded objective laws. They embraced the ideas of Masaryk, who denied the existence of regularities in social development. Thus, the ideology of the Czech bourgeoisie—Masarykism—hampered the building of socialism in Czechoslovakia.

The document, *Lessons of the Crisis Development*, lists the following regularities among "the permanent and immutable principles of socialism":

"the leading position of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party;

"the role of the socialist state as the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat;

"Marxist-Leninist ideology and its dissemination via all means of mass influence;

"socialist public ownership of the means of production and the principle of the planned management of the national economy;

"the principles of proletarian internationalism and their consistent realisation in foreign policy, especially in regard to the Soviet Union."²

Experience has shown that the Communist or Workers' parties score substantial successes in utilising the advantages of socialist construction as long as they creatively apply the general laws while giving due consideration to concrete historical conditions, especially national traditions and relations among nationalities.

But the struggle for the successful building of socialism is hampered as soon as the general laws are underestimated and the role of national specifics is exaggerated.

When this happens, the imperialist intelligence agencies step up their activity. Characteristically, imperialism smug-

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

gles into the socialist countries "experts" whose job it is to capitalise on any difficulties in order to intensify subversive activity and consolidate the anti-socialist forces which, once they are organised, might jeopardise the gains made in the building of socialism. All this is done under the guise of developing a "new model of socialism" which will supposedly be in keeping with the national peculiarities of the country concerned.

It is for good reason, therefore, that Documents of Meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties draw attention to the danger equally inherent in ignoring and in exaggerating national features, for both tendencies can be used by the forces of reaction and seriously damage the socialist cause.

The events of 1968-1969 in Czechoslovakia fully confirmed the validity of warnings made at such meetings about the danger of ignoring general laws, and about the need to give proper consideration to the general and the particular in socialist construction.

In the course of its history the CPCz scored many successes in overcoming the Masarykist approach to social regularities and built its policy on the Leninist approach, on the solid foundation of the objective laws of development. A successful socialist revolution was consummated in Czechoslovakia in February 1948 to a large extent because the CC CPCz, under the leadership of Klement Gottwald, ably combined general laws with concrete historical conditions and national traditions.

In an article entitled "The Way of Struggle and Victories", published in *Pravda* on May 13, 1971, Gustav Husák said: "The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, headed by Klement Gottwald, has provided an example of the creative Marxist-Leninist solution to problems in a concrete historical situation. With the support of the masses and observance of constitutional laws, the question of 'who will beat whom' in Czechoslovakia was settled in favour of the working class."

The following were among the distinctive prerequisites and specific features of the 1948 Socialist Revolution in Czechoslovakia:

— Developed productive forces in industry and a highly organised working class, led by the Communist Party which was tempered in the struggle against the national bourgeoisie and against the reformist ideology of the Czech bourgeoisie, namely, Right social-democratism and Masarykism.

— Trade union cohesion, with these organisations led by the CPCz and working as part of the united National Front, which supported CPCz policy.

— The political solidarity of all Republican organisations: youth organisations, co-operative societies, peasants' unions, non-proletarian parties, artists' unions, etc.

— The CPCz's wide experience in using legal forms of struggle (especially parliamentary activity through representatives of the working class in the First Republic and in the period between 1945 and 1948).

— Unselfish, friendly and fraternal assistance from the Soviet Union, beginning with the liberation of Czechoslovakia from nazism, for which cause over 140,000 men of the Soviet Army gave their lives.

In carrying out the February 1948 Socialist Revolution, the CPCz also had to take into account the existence of a substantial stratum of petty-bourgeois elements that had been brought up on Social-Democratic or Masarykist ideology. The dominant ideology in the First Republic was Masarykism. It penetrated into all segments of the population, and even into the working class, through its clever tactic of fanning and capitalising on the nationalistic enthusiasm after the country's liberation from the three-century-old Hapsburg yoke. Masarykism prevailed in science, politics, government and in the education of the upcoming intelligentsia.

The strategy and tactics of the CPCz were based on a careful study of the general laws and the national, concrete historical, external and internal conditions in which the socialist revolution ripened and was consummated.

For example, during the Second World War, the working class created national committees to protect enterprises from destruction. The committees were made up primarily of workers from the corresponding enterprises and functioned as a kind of local authority for maintaining order at the factories. When the nazi troops were forced out of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Army and the Czechoslovak Corps under the command of General Ludvík Svoboda, the owners of many large factories, who had collaborated with the nazis during the war, fled the country with the Germans. Then the National Front Government turned the management of enterprises over to the national committees. The Communist Party enjoyed prestige in the working class and in the national committees; it played the leading role in those committees and relied on their support in carrying out socialist transformations by peaceful means.

The nationalisation law adopted in 1945 made large enterprises, plants and factories the property of the state, and this brought about a radical change in the character of the people's democratic system. Later, when the new constitution was adopted, the remaining part of the country's industry was nationalised. Thus, industry became socialist property, and this meant the fulfilment of the principal demand of the socialist revolution—the establishment of public ownership of the basic means of production—with due regard for all the national features and historical conditions in the country.

Success in carrying out a peaceful socialist revolution in a highly industrialised country—which was also in line with Marxist-Leninist principles—was ensured by the fact that during the period described the CPCz neither ignored nor overestimated national specifics, but made good use of them. K. Gottwald described the situation as follows: "In our road to socialism, as well as in other People's Democracies, there is much that is distinct from the Soviet Union's road. The year 1945 itself differed from 1917. But this distinction involves only the form, but by no means the basis of the new

system, which is power in the hands of the working people, under the leadership of the working class—the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin explained this problem when he said: ‘The transition from capitalism to communism is certainly bound to yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: *the dictatorship of the proletariat.*’ ”

“It would, therefore, have been foolish and dangerous dogmatism for us not to pay attention to these differences in our path after 1945,” Gottwald continued. “On the contrary, the fact that we took them into account and were able to use them correctly helped us, along with other things, to have done away with the internal bourgeois reactionary forces in February 1948.”¹

Gottwald was so far-sighted that he warned of the possibility and danger of dogmatism and the preservation of certain national characteristics which could stand in the way of a complete victory of socialist construction. In this regard he said that it would have been criminal stupidity to try to preserve some of those “differences” which were only transitory and were gradually dying away. He stressed particularly that increasingly broad and deep use of the Soviet experience and increasing approximation to the Soviet example was one of the main laws governing the development of People’s Democracies: “Therefore, every step that brings us closer to the Soviet example, to a society which has already built socialism and which has undergone much suffering for us in seeking, cognising and discovering new forms of social life, is a successful step for us, a significant advance along the road to socialism. An example of such success is our adoption of the new Party Rules, which in their major points fully correspond with the Rules of the CPSU.

“And conversely, overemphasising and preserving lower transitory forms and treating them as immutable ‘specifics’,

¹ Kl. Gottwald, *Uýbrané spisy*, Vol. II, Praha, 1955, p. 509.

just as much as ignoring the Soviet example and experience, ultimately leads to the violation and distortion of the very foundation of people's democracy and to the restoration of capitalism."¹

Gottwald noted that Lenin had always stressed the international nature of the theory and practice of Bolshevism, and this, he added, "is fully confirmed by the experience of our Communist Party. And if our Party has achieved something, if it was able to lead our people to fight for bread and against fascism, if, finally, it was able to do away with the capitalists and traitors, it was only because we had gone to Moscow to learn from the Bolsheviks. . . ."²

Now, of course, a common international experience in building socialism has taken shape, and all the socialist countries study and learn from each other's experience. What Klement Gottwald said shortly before his death, however, is still valid today, as the international communist and workers' movement continually stresses the need to adhere to the general principles of Marxism-Leninism. The document, *Lessons of the Crisis Development*, for example, said in this connection: "These are the precepts of the revolutionary and internationalist traditions of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the behests of the finest sons of the Party, of K. Gottwald, and they have formed the inviolable foundation of the existence and strength of our Party throughout its 50-year-old history. These principles underlie the course taken by the Central Committee of the CPCz after April 1969. . . ."³

Thus, at the time of the Socialist Revolution of 1948, and in the process of building socialism, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia built its activity on an accurate analysis and consideration of general laws and specific national features, neither underestimating nor overestimating the national fea-

¹ Kl. Gottwald, op. cit., p. 509.

² Ibid., p. 508.

³ *Poučení z krizového vývoje*, pp. 43-44.

tures in the process of revolution. Much of this was due to Klement Gottwald.

An analysis of the events of the mid-1960s makes it clear that the former CPCz leadership had gradually turned away from this Leninist line and failed to take proper account of the fact that in the period of building developed socialism there is even greater need for scientifically based management of social processes, for the timely exposure and overcoming of the contradictions of development, for an even more precise and profound knowledge and creative application of general laws, just as for consideration of national specificities.

The revisionists immediately took advantage of this as they persisted in dragging in their "creative" solutions to urgent problems. This was attended by a revival of the Masarykist approach to social laws and a growth of voluntaristic tendencies in the management of social processes. Part of the CPCz leadership disregarded Gottwald's behests and began operating voluntaristically, as a consequence of which many members of the CC came forward at the December (1967) Plenary Meeting of the CC CPCz criticising the antiquated and non-socialist methods of work and leadership, demanding that a critical and self-critical analysis be made of the policy and work of the Central Committee, the Presidium and the Secretariat of the CC CPCz, and calling for the re-establishment of Leninist principles of scientific management of social development under socialism, which involves a scientific, class analysis of objective reality.

4. THE CLASS APPROACH TO PROBLEMS OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION—A MOST IMPORTANT LENINIST PRINCIPLE

Bourgeois ideologists and revisionists say that the causes of the political events in Czechoslovakia lay in the inefficacy of socialism itself; in fact, however, the opposite is true.

The favourable conditions for carrying out a socialist revolution and for the building of socialism in Czechoslovakia, plus the whole period of the CPCz's steady successes led to the development in the early 1960s of an atmosphere of complacency, to "dizziness from success", to a loss of a sense of the new and of the ability to make a realistic appraisal of the successes scored, and, consequently, to a distortion of the immediate prospects of development.

Stressing the specific features of carrying out the socialist revolution in Czechoslovakia, Klement Gottwald said: "We have a favourable confluence of circumstances, rare in history, when we carry out a revolution simultaneously from the top and from the bottom."¹

The CPCz's strong positions in the Parliament and the Government, plus its leading role among the working people made possible a peaceful socialist revolution. On the one hand, this was a great social gain, a success of the proletariat and its Party. On the other, however, it was conducive to an unwarranted slackening of attention to the class struggle that was actually continuing in new forms.

Also serving as one of the preconditions for the crisis situation in Czechoslovakia was the fact that work on some essential aspects of the theory of socialist construction was lagging behind actual practice, that little importance was attached to elaborating a theoretically sound concept of developed socialism which would take into account the specific conditions of Czechoslovakia.

As Gustav Husák pointed out, "the theoretical front ... was sufficiently strong in criticising the old methods of economic management; however, it showed itself to be unprepared for creating a new Czechoslovak concept".²

This, naturally, untied the hands of the revisionists, for it meant weakening the main weapon in the struggle against them, namely, the creative development of Marxism, the constructive elaboration of urgent current problems of social

¹ Kl. Gottwald, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

² G. Husák, *Selected Articles and Speeches*, p. 43.

development. Revisionism has always speculated on new, unresolved, insufficiently worked-out problems, using them, on the one hand, to discredit Marxism-Leninism by charging that the present and future aspects of social life can no longer be understood from Marxist-Leninist positions, and, on the other, to represent revisionism as the leading creative force of the times, claiming that it has risen to the struggle with obsolete and reactionary "dogmatic Marxism" and has produced a new, scientifically grounded model of the modern world.

The 1960s were a period when socialism was, in the main, already built in many socialist countries and when the question of the prospects for further development came to the fore in all its urgency.

The enormous international experience in building a new society that had been accumulated by that time, and the desire to ensure that society's maximum effectiveness were factors that dictated the need once again, from the perspective of what had been achieved, to gain an even deeper insight into the Marxist-Leninist teaching on socialism and communism, to consider a whole series of problems relating to the theory and practice of socialism and its periodisation, and to formulate new conclusions and propositions.

The Marxist-Leninist parties, working out their long-range tasks, took a creative approach to the question of using the experience of the CPSU, and contributed new propositions and formulations to the general theory of the periodisation of socialism.

The 12th Congress of the CPCz (1961) registered in its decisions the fact that the foundations of socialism had been built in Czechoslovakia, since by the end of the 1950s small-scale private agriculture had been, in the main, reorganised into large-scale socialist production on the basis of unified agricultural co-operatives, which meant that the predominance of socialist forms of property and socialist production relations had been established in the economy as a whole.

The Report of the CC CPCz to the 12th Congress of the

Party stated: "We are entering a new period of our history, the main content of which is the all-round development of socialist society."¹

Did the CPCz correctly define the next stage in the development of socialism? From the standpoint of its general prospects, yes. That this stage was necessary for a number of socialist countries was pointed out in the Statement of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties (1960), which said that certain socialist countries "have already entered the period of construction of a developed socialist society".²

For purposes of the scientific management of social development, however, it is not enough to outline the general prospects or merely to name the next period. The main thing is to know what content is put into that period, the main thing is to understand the essence, the basic tasks of that period, its internal mechanism, its social and temporal boundaries; the main thing is to understand the specific features of the building of developed socialism in the concrete conditions of the given country.

However, it was in precisely these aspects of practical policy-making that the leadership of the CPCz made some errors and miscalculations, as a result of which factors conducive to the onset of the events of 1968-1969 gradually increased in strength.

But it cannot be said that, formally, too little importance was attached to theory, particularly since correct creative solutions were formulated for a number of important problems. The trouble was that insufficient importance was attached to the job of keeping theory pure, because under slogans calling for increased theoretical work, revisionist elements were actually substituting a Masarykist analysis of social phenomena for a Marxist-Leninist one.

¹ *XII. sjezd Komunistické strany Československá*, Praha, 1963, pp. 24-25.

² *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, p. 45.

The predominance of Masarykism in the social consciousness in the years of the First Republic was coupled with the prevalence of structuralism as a method of cognition which gradually acquired universal significance in the social sciences of bourgeois Czechoslovakia and which was designed to edge out dialectical materialism in that field. Masarykism itself was that initial form of structuralism which had decisive influence on its subsequent flourishing in Czechoslovakia.

Claiming to be a "new", "scientific", "modern" universal method, bourgeois structuralism again occupied key positions in the social sciences in the late 1950s. The argument for reviving structuralism was that it was the only method through which it was possible to bring about a unity of science and human activity, science and humanism.

In fact, the wide use of structuralism was aimed at paralysing the creative and transforming power of Marxist philosophy and sociology, and at divorcing the social sciences from the practice of socialist construction.

Proper importance was not attached to the task of elaborating the theoretical problems of scientific communism; they were not even recognised as a separate field of study and were included in sociology, which was interpreted by many social scientists in the spirit of empirical positivism. All this opened up a wide road for the latest bourgeois sociological theories, especially the main one—the theory of a "single industrial society". This theory is the most vivid example of how structuralism distorts the basic trends of social development, the laws governing the struggle of the two world systems, and the class character of the social structures of modern societies, both capitalist and socialist.

The former leadership of the CPCz underestimated the objective circumstance that in an industrially developed country there are likely to be recurrent inclinations towards vulgar technocratic theories which attach decisive importance in historical development, including the development of socialism, to science and technology. According to such

theories, scientific and technical progress automatically solves all the social problems of modern societies, both capitalist and socialist, in view of which the social differences between the opposite world systems and between the opposite classes lose their former significance.

Many researchers in those years completely ignored the socio-economic foundations of the society, its forms of property, its production relations, and its socio-political structure, that is, all the decisive qualitative features which distinguish socio-economic formations with their specific bases and superstructures.

Increasingly, the subject of research was not the opposite systems—capitalism and socialism—but a “single industrial society”, where capitalism and socialism were seen as non-antithetical varieties of the same type of society. However, it is obvious that the social consequences of the scientific and technological revolution under capitalism are opposite to those under socialism, for only socialism and communism coincide by their very nature with the requirements of the scientific and technological revolution, impart the highest humane aims to it, and provide it with the optimal, harmonious and humane conditions of development. Capitalism, on the contrary, is incompatible with the essence of the scientific and technological revolution, for that revolution leads not only to an aggravation and deepening of all the old contradictions of capitalism, but also to the emergence of new ones, which makes its development under capitalism destructive and antagonistic.

In Czechoslovakia supporters of the theory of the single industrial society declared it to be sufficiently authoritative to serve as the basis on which practical recommendations for the leading organs of Czechoslovakia should be worked out.

This theory, however, by virtue of its class origin and ideological direction, is incompatible with the constructive goals of socialism. It has nothing in common with a scientific analysis of actual objective laws; on the contrary, it dispenses with this kind of analysis, replacing it with a bourgeois reac-

tionary utopia. The aims it pursues are to provide arguments in defence of capitalism, to cloud people's minds with illusions that class contradictions disappear in the modern world, to bring about the ideological disarmament of world socialism, and to undermine Marxist-Leninist theory as the only basis for the scientific management of social life under socialism.

It was only natural, therefore, that all the practical recommendations given on its basis could not help in solving the urgent tasks of building a socialist society in Czechoslovakia. Indeed, what could have been expected, for example, from P. Machonin's "Marxist" conception of an industrial society when he defined mature socialism simply in terms of its being a "modern industrial society" without any reference to the nature of the ownership of the means of production or the type of production relations?¹ In interpreting the social structure of the socialist society, Machonin also departed from the objective Marxist criterion of the class differentiation of society, replacing it with the subjectivist principle of social stratification which he borrowed from bourgeois sociology.

In their book, *The Czechoslovak Society*, Machonin and his group openly proclaimed their switch to positions of bourgeois sociology, declaring that "stratification means to us ... the same as to others—class crystallisation".²

The Machonin group and a number of other Czechoslovak social scientists rejected the Marxist theory of social structure and even its terminology (working class, peasantry, intelligentsia).

All these devices were aimed at supporting the denial of the class character of socialism in Czechoslovakia and, ultimately, of the leading role of the working class.

In *The Czechoslovak Society*, all the signs of the actual

¹ See *Proměny v sociální struktuře Československá a dynamika sociálně politického rozvoje*, Praha, 1966.

² P. Machonin a kolektiv, *Československá společnost*, p. 32.

dominance of the working class were declared to exist only on paper.¹

Relaxation of the class approach in the study of social development had the following consequences:

—The revival of structuralism (in essence, the Masarykist method of study) in the social sciences. This was a method that was hostile to Marxism and meant a departure from the concrete historical conditions of the class struggle outside and within the country, from the specific features of the building of socialism in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic at the given stage of its development.

—The curtailment of scientific research on problems of social structure, the role of the different classes of society, including the leading role of the working class, and the social differences between classes and social groups. This hampered the development of ways and methods of overcoming those differences.

—The political disorientation of the social consciousness and the blunting of class vigilance in a period of likely upsurges of the class struggle.

—A reassessment of the degree of class and moral political unity, which gave scope to unlimited "liberalisation" of the political life.

—A distorted view of the essence of the stage of socialism already reached and the prospects of its further development.

During the 1960s, right up to the events of 1968-1969, all this contributed to the disorientation of Party members and the scientific community, to their ideological and political disarmament, and to the revival of revisionist distortions of the very essence of socialism.

An appraisal of the situation that had developed in the 1960s was made in the Theses of the CC CPCz, "Half a Century of Struggle for the Interests of the Working Class and Peoples of Czechoslovakia": "The inability to correctly correlate the revolutionary prospects with the level of social de-

¹ See *Proměny* . . . , p. 162.

velopment led to the setting of unrealistic tasks, to the skipping over of stages of development. . . .

"The results achieved in the development of the Socialist society were overestimated, and things reached the point of illusions that we were on the threshold of a classless society."¹

This blunting of the class approach in assessing social processes was direct reflection of the Masarykist traditions which had for decades implanted class nihilism, supra-class and abstract humanistic concepts of the social structure of society, and notions that differences between the class opposites—the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the bourgeois and the socialist ideologies—had been reconciled.

Furthermore, in the course of the socialist revolution and the creation of socialism in Czechoslovakia the class struggle did not reach that intensity or the point of those open and direct battles which thoroughly expose the reactionary character of the classes hostile to socialism, thereby ensuring their isolation, and result in a clear-cut political demarcation of all classes and strata of society.

The social structure of Czechoslovakia was characterised not only by the predominance of the working class, but also by a comparatively large proportion of middle urban strata, including the petty urban bourgeoisie, office workers and the intelligentsia, among whom the bourgeois ideology held on rather tenaciously, but without an alliance with whom the working class could not win.

The hegemony of the working class and its party, therefore, assumed the form of a class alliance of several parties. On the one hand, this complicated the task of ensuring the consistent Marxist-Leninist political and ideological education of the working people and made it harder to shape and pursue a consistent class proletarian policy. On the other hand, it made it easier for the forces opposing socialism to

¹ "Půl století bojů za zájmy dělnické třídy a národů Československa Teze k 50. výročí založení KSČ", *Rudé právo*, March 25, 1971, p. 17.

disguise themselves, consolidate and act, and contributed to the tenacity of the bourgeois ideology and revisionism, especially Masarykism.

Under the conditions prevailing in Czechoslovakia, where petty-bourgeois strata, Social-Democratic traditions, the interests of social groups hostile to the cause of socialism, and the influence of Masarykism and of bourgeois ideology from without were all still strong, no effective programme for the ideological and political education of the different strata of the population was worked out, and no analysis or definition was made, as Gustav Husák noted, of "the production, social and ideological prerequisites for the all-round involvement of the former petty-bourgeois strata in the system of large-scale socialist production".¹

The 14th Congress of the CPCz worked out a programme for the further development of Czechoslovakia in strict accordance with the Leninist principle concerning the class approach to the solution of the basic tasks of socialist construction. "Our Congress is called upon to outline the main goals of Czechoslovakia's socialist development for the coming years. To do this it is necessary to make a realistic appraisal of the character of the present and coming stages, the condition and developmental trends of the society's class structure, the degree of the working people's socialist consciousness, the level of economic development, the world trends in the development of the productive forces, and the general balance of class forces in the international arena. Soberly assessing all the decisive factors, it must be said that we have not yet exhausted the possibilities of the stage of socialist development, that it is necessary to consistently observe the laws governing the development of socialist society, to strengthen socialist social relations and to proceed along the road of building a developed socialist society."²

Regarding the development of socialist society in its class,

¹ *XIV. sjezd KSČ*, pp. 26-27.

² *Ibid.*, p. 51.

political, ideological and economic interconnections as a long process, the CPCz advanced the problems of the ideological and political education of the Party and the whole people as key problems in the present period of the development of socialism.

The 14th Congress of the CPCz clearly defined the basic direction of the class struggle of the CPCz, declaring Right-wing opportunism the main danger; it revealed the class and social roots of the revival of bourgeois ideology in Czechoslovakia and worked out a programme for the ideological defeat of the anti-socialist forces in order to remove the very possibility of any revival of opportunism and revisionism.

The re-establishment of the Leninist principle of the class approach to problems of building socialism ensures a class orientation in the social sciences and all ideological work, enhances their role in the life of the society and creates a stable foundation for increasing effectiveness in the scientific management of social development.

CONCLUSION

It remains for us to summarise, in the light of our general assessment, the historical role of Masaryk. Further Marxist study of Masaryk's activity and theoretical concepts—together with works on this question already completed, such as, in particular, the one by Zdeněk Nejedlý—will help thoroughly to expose the anti-socialist, bourgeois character of the theoretical and practical activity of Masaryk himself and of his present-day followers, regardless of what "ultra-socialist" phraseology and demagoguery they may hide behind.

The history of the CPCz shows that at every stage of its development it conducted an unremitting struggle against Masarykism and for the triumph of Marxism-Leninism. We spoke of this earlier in relation to other problems.

Masaryk's role has been examined from the following basic positions: the materialist understanding of history; ascertaining the role of the popular masses in the socialist development of Czechoslovakia; the class approach in appraising the content of the present era and the stages of Czechoslovakia's development. At every stage of the struggle for the victory of Marxism-Leninism, the Communist Party explained the class nature of Masaryk's philosophy as an ideology of the bourgeoisie. But in so doing, the CPCz always took into account the people's attitude to Masaryk, the concrete political situation, and the level of the political maturity and consciousness of the working people. However, its principled attitude towards Masaryk remained unchanged. For example, the Party's position with regard to Masaryk in 1946, during the time of the Eighth Congress of the CPCz, was expressed as follows:

"...We make no secret of where we differed with Masaryk in the sense of world outlook and time. Clearly, Masaryk's role as a statesman, politician, thinker and sociologist was

great, but it did not go beyond the framework of the bourgeois era. Masaryk was not a socialist, as certain people are now trying to assert.... The new Czechoslovakia must have an ideology which differs from that of the old Czechoslovakia. And the spirit of the new Czechoslovakia is inconceivable without scientific socialism, without the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin."¹

As we can see, that description and assessment of Masaryk's activity did not contemplate a complete rejection of his historical legacy. They were objective and accorded with Party principles.

However, with the establishment and development of socialism in Czechoslovakia, the significance of this legacy and, accordingly, the assessment of it, changed. Certain progressive features of Masaryk's activity lost their meaning, while the reactionary part of the legacy (above all his revisionism and anti-communism) was put to even wider use by the Right-wing and anti-socialist forces.

A Leninist characterisation of Masaryk as a revisionist was given by the CPCz in 1962 in a book called *The History of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia*, in which we find the following statement:

"Masaryk was a typical Czech exponent of that bourgeois reformism which the experienced West European bourgeoisie used as an ideological weapon in the struggle against the socialist revolution. Bourgeois reformism, the aim of which was to preserve the bourgeois system, consisted essentially in agreeing to partial concessions, accepting the demands of limited socialism and using its terminology in order to distort and emasculate the revolutionary essence of Marx's theory as much as possible. In this regard, Masaryk was a master at coupling international revisionist theory with 'Czech socialism' and 'Czech philosophy'. Because of all these qualities, the bourgeoisie selected him to be its chief political spokesman. The transformation, during the war, of op-

¹ *Bulletin of Special Information*, No. 70, Prague, May 22, 1946.

portunism into social-patriotism, the obsolescence of the theoretical weapons of opportunist leaders, and their well-known lack of interest in questions of ideology, all led to a situation where not only the views of the opportunists fully coincided with Masaryk's, but—most importantly—they adopted his 'ideology' and arguments. In this way, the 'socialist' and 'democratic' ideology, espoused by Masaryk and the opportunist leaders of Social-Democracy, became a serious buttress for capitalism in our country."¹

As concerns the idea of Masaryk's greatness, Plekhanov gave the following description of the basic features of a "great man", proceeding from a Marxist understanding of the role of the individual in history:

"A great man is great ... because he has characteristics that make him most capable of serving the great social needs of the time that arise under the influence of general and particular causes. ... A great man is precisely an initiator because he sees farther and desires more strongly than others. He solves scientific problems that were put on the agenda by the preceding course of society's intellectual development; he points out the new social needs that were created by the preceding development of social relations, he assumes the initiative in satisfying these needs. He is a Hero! A hero not in the sense that he can presumably stop or change the natural course of things, but in that his activity is the conscious and free expression of a necessary and unconscious course. In this lies his whole significance, in this lies his strength."²

Masaryk does not fit this description because he confined the struggle for the national development of Czechoslovakia to a bourgeois framework and opposed that struggle to the struggle for socialism, thus acting counter to the basic laws of development in our era. For this reason, although he had certain progressive traits, Masaryk must be classified in the final analysis as a reactionary.

¹ *Dějiny KSČ*, p. 136.

² G. V. Plekhanov, *Selected Philosophical Works*, Vol. II, p. 333 (in Russian).

In trying to envisage the future development of his nation, Masaryk thought in terms of a bourgeois Czechoslovakia, but it became socialist. He tried to devise a theory that opposed Marxism; he preached the "crisis of Marxism". Instead of revolution, he proposed reform; instead of class struggle, he propounded reformism; instead of Marxism, he offered Masarykism, which, however, could not be a contribution to the spiritual life of mankind.

One should, however, pay due respect to the erudition and energy of the professor of the Czech University in Prague, T. G. Masaryk. His works are extensive, both in the number of fields covered and in the number of concepts examined. He dealt with problems of philosophy, history, sociology, religion, humanism, politics, democracy, socialism, communism, the state and law, national and international relations, etc. To be sure, among the Czech scholars of the 19th and early 20th century, he was an eminent figure.

He promised to create an integral teaching, but despite his striving he did not succeed. He was in doubt of his ultimate success and wrote: "In this first study I do not want to examine socialism in its entirety, but only Marxism...; in a second book I would like to write about the development of the socialist movement in the 19th century, and in conclusion, about the basic principles of social reform. But I know not whether I will have sufficient fortitude for such an undertaking."¹

As we know, revisionism has not in its entire history produced a single researcher who could develop his own integral world outlook.

What Masaryk did in his basic works above all was to fully express his negative attitude to socialism and communism and to comprehensively and systematically falsify Marxism, while at the same time concealing his real goals and views since they were oriented towards the defence of capitalism. He was precise, clear and consistent in one thing only—in his anti-communism. He did not accept Marxism.

¹ Masaryk, *Otázka sociální*, Vol. I, pp. 6-7.

Being an idealist and a religious man himself, he rejected the scientific world outlook of the proletariat. All of his arguments against Marxism were determined by the class bourgeois world outlook, whose social order he tried to fill.

But why was it that during the events of 1968, the Right-wing and anti-socialist forces, knowing of Masaryk's hostility towards communism, still propagandised Masaryk's "humane socialism"? Because overt anti-communism was doomed to failure, while in the form of "humane socialism" it could still temporarily disorient the masses.

But this was, as Gustav Husák noted, a deception of unprecedented scope which was dissipated as this method of counter-revolution increasingly exposed itself, as the real meaning of the events allied with the activity of the anti-communist centres became known to the masses.

Through its tremendous constructive activity, the CPCz won the political struggle for the minds of the people; it re-won the confidence, understanding and support of the millions of working people, which has been one of the main reasons for the steady upward progress of socialism in recent years.

The CPCz politically demolished the views, arguments and demagogy of the Right-wing and anti-socialist forces; it showed how totally incompatible their concepts were with the Marxist understanding of a socialist society.

As a result, the values of socialism were not only reinstated, but socialism became rooted even deeper in the hearts and minds of the people. The masses became convinced from their own experience that the banner of Masarykism was the banner of counter-revolution.

As Gustav Husák stressed, "the trends of development are absolutely favourable"¹ for further victories of socialism, while the hopes of the Right-wing forces for a repetition of their adventures are equal to zero.²

This means the complete historical failure of Masarykism.

¹ Gustav Husák, *Selected Articles and Speeches*, p. 560.

² *Ibid.*, p. 136.